

(2.)

AN
APPENDIX
TO THE
SUPPLEMENTAL APOLOGY
FOR THE
BELIEVERS
IN THE
SUPPOSITITIOUS SHAKSPEARE-PAPERS:
BEING
THE DOCUMENTS FOR THE OPINION
THAT
HUGH Mc AULEY BOYD
WROTE
JUNIUS'S LETTERS.

BY GEORGE CHALMERS, F.R.S.S.A.

LONDON:

Printed by Luke Hanford, Great Turnstile, Lincoln's-Inn Fields,
FOR THOMAS EGERTON, WHITEHALL.

1800.

THE PATENT

OFFICE

DELIVERED

IN

THE

OFFICE

THE PATENT

OFFICE



THE PATENT

OFFICE

DELIVERED

IN

THE

OFFICE

THE ADVERTISEMENT.

MY attention was drawn aside, by accident, to the subject of this Appendix, from more agreeable studies. When I was writing my *Postscript* to the Author of *The Pursuits of Literature*, I was led, by his declaration, "that he would quote *Junius* as an *English classic*, like *Livy* or *Tacitus*," to advert both to the *political writer*, who was, in this manner, celebrated by factiousness; and to his style, which was, thus, praised by ignorance. I was soon induced, by my conviction, to say, that I had seen documents, which satisfied me, that Hugh M'Auley was the real author of *Junius's* epistles. As some of these documents had been freely communicated to me by Mr. L. D. CAMPBELL, the Editor of *The Indian Observer*, delicacy forbade me to anticipate what he intended to publish, on the same point: But, he has blunted my sensations of delicacy, on this head, by attacking me, in the news-papers, on a mere difference of taste. I now feel myself, therefore, at liberty to obey the calls, that have been made on me, to submit to the judgements of others the same documents, which had brought conviction to my mind. In doing this, I have no other interest, than to prove, that I spoke not of documents, which I did not possess, and have no other purpose, than to show, that I seldom deliver opinions, which I cannot support by argument, and fact.

I do not regret, that a literary contest has arisen, from my intimations upon a subject, not a little curious in itself, although the overflowings of the gall, which were excited by it, have soiled the outside of my habit. I have looked on upon the com-

THE ADVERTISEMENT.

bat, without entering the lists ; in order to see, more clearly, the peculiar artifices of the combatants, and the real objects of the battle. The Public has gained some advantages : additional facts have been ascertained ; new circumstances have been disclosed ; and appropriate inferences have been drawn, which, in the course of research, will lead to the establishment of truth. Interest may, indeed, perplex for a while, and scepticism may delude ; but time will produce such knowledge, as will, in the end, fix all opinions in one judgement,

Before the publication of my *Supplemental Apology*, Mathias filled the news-papers, and the literary journals, with inquiries about the author of *his Pursuits of Literature* : he now fills both, with questions about the writer of *Junius* ; thereby imitating the instinctive policy of the lapwing, which may deceive children, but not men. Personal lampoon, and artificial mystery, gave a temporary currency to the first of those libels, and have given it to the last : I will venture to foretel, that the same moment the mask shall be torn from the face of *Junius*, he will be consigned to neglect ; he will, thenceforth, be no more regarded, than is the Author of the *Pursuits of Literature*, who brought himself into notice by the same means ; viz. by the prostitution of his talents, whatever they may be, and by gross abuse of the characters of others, however respectable. Of *Junius*, I will conclude, in Johnson's words : " He will soon be more attentively examined, and what folly has taken for a comet, that from its flaming hair shook pestilence and war, inquiry will find to be only a meteor, which, having plunged its followers in a bog, will leave us inquiring, why we regarded it ? "

THE following sheets were printed some months ago ; But, understanding that *the Works of Hugh Boyd* were soon to be published, I thought it prudent to wait their appearance ; in

THE ADVERTISEMENT.

order to see, whether they contained any documents, that would either confute my reasoning, or confirm my judgment. I have, however, found nothing in them, which has in the least changed my opinions, with regard to the author of Junius, to the character of M^cAuley Boyd, or to the conduct of the Editor of his works. He has, indeed, published what I have often quoted, as the *unpublished letter* of Mr. Almon. He has republished the *Whig* from Almon's *Political Anecdotes*, which I have also quoted. He has, moreover, published, as the productions of his author, several seditious Essays from the Newspapers. Yet, his researches did not enable him to publish what I have now published, the WILL of M^cAuley's father: neither has he given a *fac simile* of the hand-writing of his author, which I have superadded, though I have not insisted on the comparison of writings, either feigned, or real, as a proof. From the inspection of several letters of Boyd, and of his wife, I perceive, that *he* wrote most like a woman, and *she* most like a man. The editor has, at the same time, suppressed what I have quoted from his OBSERVER, p. 346. N^o L. as an important document, for shewing, at once, the *cloven foot* of Junius, and Boyd's real sentiments on the French Revolution. What other suppressions or interpolations, there may be in *Boyd's Works*, I have neither opportunity, nor leisure, nor inclination, to develope.

I see that the editor of Boyd's Works is still angry with me; because I think differently from him about his favourite author, although I have laboured, with full as much diligence as himself, and perhaps with full as much success, in proving his fundamental proposition, that M^cAuley Boyd was the real author of Junius's Letters: And, he continues to harp, with recriminating quill, on my figurative expression, that M^cAuley Boyd was an *United Irishman*. We only differ in *taste*, as I have already intimated: We agree, in asserting, that M^cAuley Boyd wrote Junius's Epistles, the *Antrim Freeholder*, the *Whig*, and the *Observer*; but, *his taste* induces him to consider those publications, as very temperate, loyal, and meritorious, effusions of a good subject; on the contrary, *my taste* prompts me to infer from the
same

THE ADVERTISEMENT.

same premises, that the Antrim Letters are anarchical, that *the Whig* is seditious, and that Junius is turbulent, even to the very verge of treason: His taste induces him to reject the judgements of our courts of justice, as to the matter of Junius; my taste leads me to bow down to their authority, and to reprobate the writer, who was, thirty years ago, "disowned, as a dangerous auxiliary, by every party, in the kingdom." The editor's taste induces him to regard the style of Junius as supremely excellent: my taste prompts me to concur with Johnson, who exploded it, with Gibbon, who did not admire it, with C. J. Fox, who spoke slightly of it, and with Wilkes, who saw its defects. His taste leads him to consider the republication of seditious libels, as laudable: My taste prompts me to regard the republication of libels, as libellous. The editor's taste induces him to attempt the hard task of *washing the Blackamoor white*: My taste leads me, as a biographer, to exhibit the subject, as he exhibited himself, by his actions, without endeavouring to whiten what cannot be made bright, or to blacken what cannot be made more unseemly. But, about *taste*, I have no purpose to dispute either now, or hereafter, with the disputatious, and tasteful, editor of *Boyd's Works*.

It is of far greater importance to state, that the death of that excellent man, the Rev. Dr. Warton, now permits me to avow, that the anecdote in page 10, note (i), with regard to the first connection of W. G. Hamilton and Edmund Burke, I received from that admirable critic, who was *the proper judge of classical lore*, who recommended Burke to Hamilton; that the *respectable friend*, who is mentioned in page 16, note (q) was also Dr. Warton, who is again quoted in page 35, note (q) as my *intelligent friend*. I lament, that it is not in my power to avow, with equal distinctness, the other authorities, who gave me so much useful information; and who are equally respectable.

If there be any person, who is possess of facts, or documents, which would prove, affirmatively, that some other writer, than

M'Auley

THE ADVERTISEMENT.

M'Auley Boyd, was the author of Junius, such person ought to come forward, in his proper character, and lay before the public, without reserve, such facts, and documents: If he do not, the proofs and argument, which I now fairly submit to the world, will, after awhile, convince all impartial readers, that M'Auley Boyd did certainly write *Junius's Letters*.

THE ADVERTISEMENT

41-1-1871. The above is a list of the names of the persons who have been appointed to the various offices of the Corporation of the City of London, for the year 1871. The names are given in alphabetical order, and the offices are given in the margin. The names are given in the margin, and the offices are given in the margin.



AN
APPENDIX
TO THE
SUPPLEMENTAL APOLOGY:
BEING
THE DOCUMENTS FOR
THE OPINION
THAT HUGH M^cAULAY BOYD WROTE
JUNIUS'S LETTERS.

DURING the progress of inquiry, and the investigation of truth, it gave me satisfaction to observe, that the little, which I had said, in my *Supplemental Apology*, about the writer of Junius, had produced some useful information, at the same time, that it gave rise to a little controversy: yet; in my mind, it deducts somewhat from the amount of such gratification to observe, that new anecdotes about Spenser, additional information about Shakspeare, and curious documents about Milton, should be less interesting to the *Mob of Gentlemen, who write with ease*, than the detection of such a scribbler as Mathias, or the exposing of such an anarchist as M^cAulay.

What is, however, more distant will generally strike with less force than what is more near. The dispu-

tants felt little interest in Spenser, Shakspeare, and Milton, whatever they might feel, or pretend to feel, about Junius. They were apprehensive, it seems, lest an imposition should be practised on the public; and they were, therefore, disposed rather to embrace error, with all her ugliness, than to welcome truth with all her beauty. I opposed the quoting of Junius, as a classical authority; because neither his style, nor his sentiment, appeared to me to merit that distinction; whatever might be declared by ignorance, or conceived by Jacobinism. I have reviewed my opinion, as to who was the author of those celebrated letters, and I see no reason to retract it: on the contrary, after reconsidering my documents, I am more fully convinced, notwithstanding all that I have seen, and read, that Hugh M'Aulay Boyd was the real author of those political papers, whatever may be the dignity of their manner, or the value of their matter.

I now presume to give the result of my inquiries, with respect to a subject, which is surely harmless enough, if it be merely a question, who wrote a seditious paper, thirty years ago, whatever any man may think of the *presumption* of exercising, liberally, the private right of public discussion, on such a subject.

I will proceed, briefly, to submit my facts, and arguments, to all, who can find an interest, or feel a gratification, in the inquiry; who can read, without prejudice, and determine, without partiality. I will divide what I have to say into two heads: 1st. I will inquire, who did *not* write Junius's Epistles; and, 2dly, I will endeavour to show, who did write those Letters.

FIRST :

FIRST: It has been supposed, though I know not on what evidence of fact, or deductions of argument, that *Junius* was some great character; some man of great rank; some writer of great erudition; some lawyer of great knowledge; some politician of great importance. Yes: Every impostor pretends to vast consequence, when he wishes to impose upon the world: *Paine* pretended to be a person of great importance, when he offered his jacobinical pamphlets to the English world: *Mathias*, when he wanted to circulate his jacobinical *Pursuits*, arrogated the privileges, belonging to a member of parliament of high rank, and to a scholar of vast learning. But, what are the pretensions of *Junius* to greatness? As a man of quality, he condescended to write three years in the newspapers [from the 21st of January 1769 to the 21st of January 1772]; to altercate with Mr. Horne; to correspond with Mr. Wilkes; and to mingle in City politics with Bellas and Crosby, Sawbridge, and Townshend. He was, plainly, *a man of the town*, who ran about the streets, for three successive years, collecting information, for the purpose of scribbling speedy answers to petty objections. The improbability, that a man of quality would act thus, without any perceivable motive, cannot be repelled by the consideration “ of the tone of equality, which he “ seemed to use, in his expressions, respecting persons “ of rank.” It might, by parity of reason, be said, that he must have been a King; because he had the audacity to write familiarly to *his* King. From recent experience, we know, that every anarchist writes of the greatest personages, with perfect equality; because

THE APPENDIX. [WITH REGARD

their purpose is to degrade greatness, by insults on the high. Whoever undertakes to maintain an egregious improbability ought to bring with him into court the strongest evidence.

He who contends for the *erudition* of Junius, would do well to produce examples of his profound literature, in order that his pretensions may be scanned. When *erudition* is mentioned, we think of Bentley, or Bryant, of Buchanan, or Ruddiman; not of a pert templar, who is just come from College, with an high conceit of his own knowledge. It was the opinion of Wilkes, and his associates, "that the writer of Junius was not an author by profession, from the visible improvements, which were, successively, discernable in his style (a)." Without knowing the opinions of others, it appeared distinctly to me, that the papers of Junius were produced by a juvenile writer, who had not formed his style, upon any model, nor by any rule. I am still of this opinion, after reviewing the corrected Edition of his Epistles.

But, he was perhaps a great Jurist. A Commentator upon *Coke-Littleton* avers, that Junius "was not a profound Lawyer, from the gross inaccuracy of some of his legal expressions (b)." Junius, it seemeth, did not understand the *Termes del ley*. In that opinion I concur, from a consideration of the absurd reasonings, and unconstitutional doctrines of Junius.

Well: He was a writer of political importance. Yet, he did not acquire this importance from inheri-

(a) Anti-Jacobin Rev. July, 1799. p. 347.

(b) Id.

tance, but by purchase: He scribbled himself, and was scribbled by others, into importance. "Of all the political writers," says Junius himself (c), modestly, "that have distinguished themselves since the accession of the House of Brunswick to the throne of Great Britain, the Author of Junius's Letters is undoubtedly one of the most eminent. Others have espoused as noble a cause, and with equal zeal, but few or none with equal abilities." In his *Letters to the Freeholders of Antrim*, in 1776, he claims to be considered as the greatest constitutional writer: Locke, he allows, did much; but Junius did more. These are, no doubt, very weighty reasons, for acknowledging the great importance of this political writer. He was, however, a formidable antagonist to individuals, and a powerful opponent to government.

By this brief investigation of the question, who was not the Author of Junius, in general, we are led, by an easy progress, to the inquiry, who was not, in particular, the writer of that famous paper. And, thus, freeing ourselves, by that investigation, from prejudice, we shall proceed, in the inquiry, with more coolness; we shall listen to facts, and circumstances, with more attention; and shall judge with due impartiality, concerning this mysterious question.

—LORD SACKVILLE—

Was one of the respectable personages, to whom the letters of Junius were early attributed, for the

(c) Anecdotes of the Author, prefixed to the 8vo. Ed. 1771, p. 1.

purpose of deception : But, those, who wished to conceal the truth, or to propagate the error, appear to have known little of the person accused, or of the scribbler concealed.

Lord George Sackville was the third son of Lionel, the first Duke of Dorset, by Elizabeth, the daughter of Lieutenant General Colyear; and was born on the 26th of January 1715-16. He owed the first part of his scholastic education to Westminster School, and the last part to Trinity College, Dublin: He wrote Latin verses, while at Westminster, on the accession of George 2d; and he is said to have, afterwards, done credit to his instructors at Dublin. He, however, chose arms for his profession. He received his first commission in 1737; and he rose, by one-and-twenty years of various, and distinguished, services, to be a Lieutenant General, a Privy Counsellor, and the Commander in Chief of the British forces in Germany. At the Battle of Minden, owing to some misunderstanding, which has not yet been clearly explained, he incurred the virtual censure of Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick, the celebrated General of the allied troops, which, by drawing on him the indignation of the late King, occasioned his dismissal from the army.

At the commencement of a new reign, much is generally forgotten, and more is silently forgiven. On the accession of his present Majesty, Lord Sackville was received at Court with the grace, which Courts seldom deny to high birth, senatorial dignity, and considerable talents. For this courtly reception, however, was the government reviled, by the studied acrimony

mony of the North Briton (*d*). From these intimations, it is apparent, that Lord Sackville had not received any unkindness from the King; and had not, consequently, any temptation to mingle in City politics, on behalf of Wilkes, who had reviled him, with unprovoked illnature. Yet, was the writing of the Letters of Junius attributed to Lord Sackville, on I know not what pretence, except the mere suspicion of Sir William Draper. At the age of fifty-three, Lord Sackville could not have any one motive to revile the King, to criminate the government, and to promote the interests of Wilkes, to whom he, certainly, owed no favours. The imputation of his being the writer of Junius's Epistles is, therefore, contrary to all the suggestions of common sense, and is inconsistent with every rule of probability. Lord Sackville, when he heard, that the papers of Junius were imputed to him, voluntarily, disavowed an imputation, which did no credit to his character. To a most respectable friend, a Fellow of the Royal Society, who then lived in habits of intimacy with him, his Lordship privately said, what he probably designed should be, publicly, repeated: "I should be proud to be capable of writing as Junius has done; but, there are many passages, in his Letters, I should be very sorry to have written."

Lord Sackville became Secretary of State in 1775; and afterwards a Peer of Parliament. He died, with the fortitude of a Soldier, and the resignation of a Christian, on the 26th of August 1785 (*e*).

(*d*). N^o 46.

(*e*) There is a full account of Lord Sackville, in the European Magazine, for September, and October, 1785.

—WILLIAM GERARD HAMILTON—

Has been supposed, with still more confidence, to be the mysterious writer of Junius's letters. This gentleman was descended from the respectable family of Hamilton of Wisshaw, in Ayrshire, which family has lately succeeded, by descent, in a resplendent line of ancestors, to the Peerage of Belhaven. He was the son of William Hamilton, of Lincoln's Inn, by Helen Bruce, the sister of David Bruce, of Kinaird, and the aunt to James Bruce, the celebrated traveller. William Hamilton left the Scottish, for the English, Bar, soon after the Union; and rose, by his talents, and application, to great eminence in his profession, and lived to acquire abundant wealth. He became a Bench-er of the Society, the Treasurer of Lincoln's Inn, in 1752, and he died, on the 15th of January, 1754.

William Gerard Hamilton was born, in Lincoln's Inn, on the 28th day of January 1728-9 (*ff*). He was educated under the Reverend Doctor Barton at Winchester, and he afterwards entered, as a Gentleman Commoner, in Oriel College, Oxford; where he associated with men, who were eminent for birth, literature, and talents. In this learned Society he

(*ff*) "Lincoln's Inn: William Gerard Hamilton, son of William Hamilton, Esq; and Helen his wife, was born January 28th, was baptized February 25th, 1728."

"The above is a true copy from the Register of Baptisms kept in Lincoln's Inn Chapel, made this 5th day of November 1799, by me William Walker, Chaplain."—This Certificate, by ascertaining the fact, settles decisively the differences of the literary journals, with regard to the age of William Gerard Hamilton.

distinguished

distinguished himself by the publication of two English Odes, which were admired, for strength of sentiment, and elegance of language. In this Society, however, he dissipated both his health, and his fortune: His dissipation entailed upon him a paralytic affection, which gave a colour to his whole life. Here too, he incurred debts to the amount of £. 4,000 sterling, which his father generously paid; and this suggested to a man of his father's prudence, to entail his whole estate upon his son, for life, and upon his own brothers, in succession.

William Gerard Hamilton, intending to follow his father's profession, entered himself in Lincoln's Inn. But, his habits of dissipation, his expectation of wealth, and his passion for politics, disqualified him for the pursuit of the object, which had been rather taken up, naturally, from his father, than chosen by himself. Soon after the decease of his father, he became a Member of the House of Commons, as representative for Petersfield. He continued on this great theatre, where he *once* distinguished himself, and ought always to have shone, till the last year of his life (g). It was Henry Fox, a noted statesman of that age, who first discerned, in the youthful orator, talents for a popular assembly, though they flashed but for a night. This flash, however, gave him a seat at the Board of Trade, with Lord Halifax; where he

(g) In 1754, William Gerard Hamilton was chosen for Petersfield; in 1761, for Pontefract; in 1768, for Old Sarum; in 1774, for Wareham; in 1780, for Wilton; in 1784, for Wilton; in 1790, for Haslemere: And he declined, at the election, in 1796. —[Parl. Reg.]

continued

continued to sit, till his Lordship was appointed, in March 1761, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (*h*).

When William Gerard Hamilton was entering into political life, he felt the inconvenience of having neglected study, during that period of youth, when study ought to be the only occupation. Thus feeling his defects, he naturally wished for help: He became desirous of the assistance of some person of superior attainments, to read with him the Latin, and the Greek, Classics: Edmund Burke was, accordingly, recommended to him, by a proper judge of classical lore, as a fit master to read with him, in a critical manner, the ancient authors (*i*). Such was the commencement of the connection, between William Gerard Hamilton, and Edmund Burke, which, though it did not last long, was undoubtedly honourable to both parties.

When Lord Halifax was named Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in March 1761, William Gerard Hamilton was appointed his Secretary, at the age of thirty-two. Edmund Burke, who was about the same age, was chosen for the Secretary of the Secretary. Lord Halifax opened the first Parliament of Ireland, during this reign, on the 11th of October 1761, with a speech

(*h*) On the 24th of April 1756, William Gerard Hamilton was appointed a Commissioner for Trade; he was re-appointed, on the 11th December 1756; again on the 24th December 1759; and again in January 1760; but he was not appointed, on the 21st of March 1761, when Lord Sandys was placed at the head of the Board, in the room of Lord Halifax, who was declared Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.—[Court Reg.]

(*i*) I have been told this anecdote by two such respectable authorities, as leave not the least doubt about the fact.

of

of less elegance than might have been expected from such a concurrence of talents. It was, in this parliament, that William Gerard Hamilton made some speeches, which were sufficient, at least, to free him from the *sobriquet*, which was improperly annexed to his name. It may be allowed, however, that he spoke, in that parliament, as cowards fight, when they are driven to the wall, by compulsion. The inability of William Gerard Hamilton, as a public speaker, was not owing to a defect of talents, but to a want of nerves. At the end of the session, Lord Halifax returned, with great parliamentary applause, to England, where he was placed at the head of the Admiralty, for a while; and was soon after appointed Secretary of State, in October 1762. His influence, in this situation, procured for William Gerard Hamilton, on the 30th of September, 1763, the respectable office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, in Ireland, for life, on the resignation of Sir William Yorke, who was allowed a pension of twelve hundred pounds. Such an office, with the rank of a Privy Counsellor, was a provision, quite equal to his pretensions, amid the competitions of persons, and the revolutions of parties.

The year 1765, as it is the epoch of a ministerial change, also marks the period of the separation of William G. Hamilton, and Edmund Burke, who both courted the same mistress, but with different talents, and dissimilar address. Time, and chance, have not yet revealed the document, which contains the genuine terms of their final disunion. As if to supply the void, which this rupture occasioned, William G.
Hamilton

Hamilton solicited the friendship of the late Doctor Johnson, who appears to have entered with ardour into his views, whatever they were (*k*).

The usual irresolution of Hamilton, probably obstructed the original purpose of Johnson. But, a friendly connection began, which was long continued by the generosity of Hamilton, and the gratitude of Johnson; who admired his conversation, which was only forced, and esteemed his liberality, which was only offered (*l*).

William G. Hamilton retained his office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, one-and-twenty years: And, when a new policy required, that the duty of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in Ireland, should be discharged, as in England, in proper person, and with official responsibility, he resigned it for an annual pension of two thousand pounds. In the mean time, William G. Hamilton was not idle: He intrigued much; he wrote much, though he published little; and he studied most of the great questions, which came before the parliament, during an interesting period, in order that he might have an opinion to give, without making a speech. He died, on the 16th

(*k*) On the 26th of September 1765, Johnson made a prayer on his "engaging in POLITICS with H—n." [Bosw. Life, vol. i. p. 454.]

(*l*) When Johnson was confined, by a long indisposition, in 1783, Hamilton offered him, by Dr. Brocklesby, money, which, as it was not wanted, was declined: This act of friendship induced, however, Johnson to write Hamilton two admirable Letters, which are preserved by Boswell. [Ib. vol. iii. p. 501. 635.]

of July 1796 (*m*); leaving by a short will, with several codicils, his natural daughter, Charlotte Geddicot, residuary legatee. His books were sold by auction; but, a very large collection of manuscripts, which were chiefly of his own composing, was, cautiously, reserved, for the instruction of posterity.

Of this person, it has been still more confidently said, that he wrote the Epistles of Junius: For, "the story is, that single-speech Hamilton informed one of his friends, that the Junius of the morning contained such and such passages, and that till the subsequent day no such Junius made his appearance:" Wilkes, and his associates, thought this story sufficiently authenticated; but, they also thought it sufficiently accounted for, by the supposition, that Woodfall had shewn the letter to Hamilton, on the preceding day, and mentioned his intention of inserting it, but had been, unexpectedly, prevented (*n*). Before we draw conclusions from such a story, all its circumstances of limitation, and explanation, ought to be attended to. The unqualified proposition, then, is, that a Privy Counsellor of Ireland, and the King's Chancellor of the Exchequer, in that kingdom, published letters, reviling the King's government, and

(*m*) Gent. Mag. p. 702, which states his age, mistakingly, at sixty-nine, instead of sixty-seven. He was buried in the chancel vault of the church of St. Martin in the Fields, Westminster. His father bequeathed him, specifically, a snuff-box, with a picture of Mary Queen of Scots, in the lid of it: What became of this snuff-box, which ought to have descended, as an heirloom, I could not learn: Perhaps, it was sent to the broker's, with some ancient family pictures.

(*n*) See the letter of Mr. C. B. in the Anti-Jacobin Rev. for July, 1799, p. 348.

reflecting

reflecting on the King's person. That a politician, whose great defect was *want of nerves*, published libels, which, to write, required the greatest intrepidity, and, to publish, incurred uncommon risque, is an improbability, which requires the strongest proof. The proposition supposes, that William Gerard Hamilton, at the age of forty, when men are seldom fools, with an ample provision, would act, like an adventurer of two-and-twenty, who had a fortune to make, or to retrieve; that he would continue, for years, to act, without a motive, offensively to those, who had not injured him, and risque much, on the hope of little. The proposition supposes, also, that he would revile the administration, whereof his friend Lord Halifax formed a part (*o*); that his well known intimacy with Lord Mansfield did not prevent him from persecuting that great Judge, with unrelenting malevolence. Moreover, the proposition supposes, that William Gerard Hamilton would revile Doctor Johnson, whose friendship he courted, because he wanted his literary help (*p*). Upon this general view of the proposition,

(*o*) The first Letter of Junius is dated January 21st, 1769; the last on January 21st, 1772: Lord Halifax was made Privy Seal, on February 9th, 1770; and Secretary of State, January 22d, 1771; and he died, on the 12th June of the same year.

(*p*) Junius censured him in that coarse language, which he used, at times, "An exceptionable passage in the conduct of Junius [Edmund Burke] when he lavished panegyric, before a great assembly, on the flagitious author of an infamous pamphlet, entitled, the FALSE ALARM; a pedantic pedagogue, who after having spent half a century of his life in cultivating a rooted antipathy to the family on the throne, and the most rancorous abuse of the Hanover succession, had accepted of that gratuitous

position, every probability forbids our belief of a story, which, however confidently told, is very loosely supported. I will confirm this improbability by a proof, which wise men have deemed decisive. I have been assured by persons, who were intimately connected with William Gerard Hamilton, that when he drew towards his latter end, he said to them: "That as he supposed, there would be hereafter some inquiries made, about the writer of Junius, he would assure them, that *he was not*; but that he knew, who was the author of that paper." We thus see a man, who acted, mysteriously, all his life-time, dying with mystery in his mouth, as there is, indeed, also mystery in his will. I can easily credit him, when he

" gratuitous emolument from the Crown, which he had constantly
 " stigmatized as the wages of iniquity, and in his old age most
 " fervently prostituted his pen, for that wretched hire he had so
 " long and loudly condemned. And yet, because this formal pe-
 " dant could expatiate on trifles, swell insignificance by amplifica-
 " tion, give verbosity to sense, and pomposity to sound, he was de-
 " fended by Junius [Ed. Burke] as a paragon of integrity; as if
 " men of letters were privileged to betray their country, and the
 " superior knowledge of what is right entitles men to do wrong.
 " [Pref. Anecdotes of Junius to his Edition of 1771.]" In this
 manner, must we suppose, William Gerard Hamilton to have writ-
 ten of Johnson, whom he admired, and courted. The above quo-
 tation furnishes a happy specimen of the genuine *balderdash* of
Junius, who expatiates on trifles, swells insignificance by amplifica-
 tion, substitutes sophistry for sense, and verbosity for sound: As
 soldiers cannot draw their swords in a nobler cause, than the sup-
 port of the laws; men of letters cannot use their pens more
 honourably, than by defending their country, when its establish-
 ments are undermined by faction, and attacked by anarchy. Su-
 perior knowledge ought to understand, that it is but wretched
 logick, which supposes the point, that philosophy ought to
 prove.

says,

says, that he was not the writer of Junius's Letters; because I think he was incapable of writing them; but I do not believe, that he knew the author; because the writer was too cunning to reveal his important secret; and William Gerard Hamilton, like other professed politicians, always thought himself a skilful diver into the profound below the common current of life, although he swam on the mere surface of politics, as they glided along (*q*).

—EDMUND BURKE.—

There are very intelligent persons, who positively say, as they were not cured of their dogmatism by the sceptical reasonings of his biographers, that this uncommon man was the real author of Junius's Letters.

The Burkes of Ireland are descended, either directly, or collaterally, from the great de Burgh of feudal times. Edmund Burke was the son of John Burke, of the city of Dublin, gentleman. About the exact time of his birth there is some doubt. His biographer tells, that he was born, in the city of Dublin, on the 1st of January 1730: On the contrary, the Register of Trinity College, which records the admis-

(*q*) A most respectable friend, who knew Hamilton from his youth, has written to me as follows: "Gerard Hamilton had abilities sufficient, and abilities of that sort, as made it highly probable he wrote *Junius*; but, at the time, we of his acquaintance, all agreed, that he had not political courage enough; as caution was a great feature in his character." Almon, who knew most of the political intrigues of those ardent times, says that William Gerard Hamilton, who spent many an hour in his parlour, did not write Junius.

tion

sion of Edmund Burke into that celebrated seminary, counts his age at sixteen, when he was admitted into it a pensioner, on the 14th of April 1743 (*r*). He received the rudiments of learning at the school of Balynore; he compleated his knowledge of letters at the university of Dublin. From this eminent seat of learning he departed, probably, in 1748. A story is told of Edmund Burke, that his first ambition consisted in a desire to succeed his countryman Dr. Hutchinson, as professor of moral philosophy, in the university of Glasgow. But, as Dr. Hutchinson died, while Edmund Burke was, in years, only a boy, and in academic honours, only a scholar, this tale, which has been often told, cannot possibly be true (*s*).

(*r*) The Beauties of Edmund Burke, p. iii:—"1743, April 14. Edmundus Burke, Pens. filius Johannis, Gen. annum agens 16, natus Dublinii, educatus sub ferulâ M. Shakelton. Tut. D. Pellifier." Elected a Scholar of the House 26th of May 1746; commenced A. B. the 23d of February 1747-8: But he does not appear to have been elected a *Native*, who is entitled to an annual stipend after a certain standing. I follow the evidence of this Record, which is the best evidence, till the Record of his baptism is produced.

(*s*) Dr. Francis Hutchinson died, at Dublin, on the 8th of August 1746. [Scots Mag. 398.] The University of Glasgow, who have the right of nomination to this chair, elected, in the room of Dr. Hutchinson, on the 1st of October 1746, Mr. Thomas Craigie, the Professor of Hebrew in the University of St. Andrews. [Ib. 451.] In April 1752, the celebrated Dr. Adam Smith was elevated to this chair, on the decease of Craigie. [Ib. 214.] At this epoch, indeed, the story would apply to Edmund Burke. And, Dr. Smith was succeeded by the excellent Dr. Thomas Reid, on the 22d of May 1764. [Ib. 292.]

It is material to remark, that Edmund Burke first came forth, as a political writer, against the noted demagogue Doctor Lucas, in 1749: His youthful mind perceived the pernicious tendency of levelling doctrines; and his forward talents exposed the dangerous consequences of democratic innovations (1). About the year 1752, Edmund Burke left Dublin, and Lucas, for the very dissimilar scenes of London, and the Temple; and exchanged faction, and wrangling, for the law, and love: Which of the Temples had the honour to teach the English law to Edmund Burke we are not told; but it is certain, that he married, while he was yet a templar, Jane Mary Nugent, the accomplished daughter of Doctor Nugent, a woman, who, during the various fortunes of her husband, showed, by her conduct, that she was worthy of the choice of such a man.

We may easily suppose, that the law did not altogether engross the time and talents of Edmund Burke. He read, with attention, and scorn, the works of Lord Bolingbroke, which, when published by Malloch, were presented by the grand jury of Westminster, as a nuisance. Burke now attacked Bolingbroke, as he had formerly attacked Lucas; from the same honourable motives: He abhorred the principles, and opposed the practices, of both, from a conviction of their dangerous tendency. In May 1756, he published, anonymously, his first pamphlet; "A Vindication of Natural Society; or a View of the Miseries arising to Mankind from every Species of Artificial

(1) The Life of Burke, p. 19.

"Society: By a late noble Writer." Irony appears upon the face of the title page with a light sufficiently strong: Yet, the style, and sophistry, of Bolingbroke, are so artfully imitated, that the critics were imposed upon, as they usually are, by putting on the spectacles of self-sufficiency. For the copy-right of this eighteen-penny pamphlet, which was published by Cooper, Edmund Burke was paid six guineas. I have heard it wittily remarked, that Burke received six pounds for sowing the seeds of French principles, and a thousand for spoiling the harvest (*u*): But, wit, and truth, seldom play their coruscations long together, in the same atmosphere!

We had now commenced our war with France about American boundaries. Every tongue talked, in 1756, about our American rights; and every pen scribbled about our checks by land, and our successes by sea: While curiosity was awake, and inquiry was active, Edmund Burke produced, in April 1757, "An Account of the European Settlements in America." He was paid for the copy-right of this history, which was received with an universal welcome, fifty guineas. Of this work, he would never admit, that he was the author. Yet, such are its comprehensive brevity, and its elegant precision, that this book is not unworthy of the genius, and talents of Edmund Burke. I do not however say, but that a man of more elaboration than the author, with American Records at his hand, could detect in it many inaccuracies of assertion, and expose many deficiencies of policy.

(*u*) Edmund Burke received a thousand pounds for the produce of his celebrated Reflections on the French Revolution.

It is curious to remark, that the taste of Burke corresponded with the judgment of Hume, in historic writing: They both concurred in approving simplicity of style, and strength of remark. Upon these principles, Edmund Burke engaged, at a subsequent day, in writing a history of England, which proceeded to the press; but it was suppressed, from a consideration of the popular prevalence of Hume's history. It is easy to perceive, from an examination of his *European Settlements*, that Burke, in history, would have shewn, like Hume, great profundity of observation, and elegance of narrative; but with all, great want of elaboration.

Edmund Burke was too busy, at that period of his life, for historical research: But he produced soon after, "A philosophical Inquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful." Of this elegant book, Johnson remarked, "We have an example of true criticism in Burke's Essay on the Sublime and Beautiful." It was criticized by Murphy, with such extent of observation, and such vigour of style, as to have induced competent judges to attribute the criticism to Johnson. For a little book, which was thus said to have given an example of *true criticism*, Burke received from the bookseller twenty guineas, from his father a hundred pounds, and from the public, lasting reputation, as a writer.

Invigorated by all those motives, Edmund Burke soon engaged in a work, which will transmit his celebrity through as long a period, and with as lasting renown, as his Essay on the Sublime and Beautiful. In April 1758, he entered into an engagement, for a hundred

dred pounds a year, to compile the *Annual Register*; comprehending a view of the history, politics, and literature of the year. On these three topicks, it is easy to trace, in the *Annual Register*, the effusions of the heart, and the sketches of the hand of Burke, which gave an high colouring to the pages of this useful work, during every period of his fortunes. Much of the meaner matter, such as state-papers, projects, baptisms, burials, and preferments, was, doubtless, supplied by inferior hands; by shopmen, and printers. Edmund Burke had now contrived some employment for himself; though perhaps not full occupation for a mind of such vigour, and activity.

The time was at length come, when he was to engage in an employment of a very different sort. His early connection with William Gerard Hamilton, naturally, led him out of the primrose path of literature, into the thorny ways of politics. When Lord Halifax went to Ireland, as Lord Lieutenant, William Gerard Hamilton accompanied him as the Secretary, with Edmund Burke, for his private Secretary. At Dublin, Hamilton and Burke lived together, in the same house, as their connection suggested, and their business required. Lord Halifax's administration was ably conducted, and ended happily. Hamilton secured for himself the Office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, and for Burke, a pension of three hundred pounds a year. In June 1762, Lord Halifax was placed at the head of the Admiralty: and the two Secretaries remained in Ireland, under the Earl of Northumberland, the new Lord Lieutenant, till the appoint-

ment of Lord Drogheda, as his Secretary, towards the end of 1763.

But, alas! the two Secretaries, and companions, Hamilton, and Burke, were soon, as politicians, to part for ever. With talents less useful, and brilliant, than Burke's, Hamilton enjoyed a high rank, and a considerable office, without a family to provide for; Burke was amply qualified by nature, and study, for private conversation, for public speaking, and for writing, in almost every mode. Seeing that it was impossible to fix the irresolution, or to rouse the indolence of Hamilton, during times of perturbation, in which ambition cannot be idle, Burke gave him epistolary notice, "that he must politically associate with men of more active exertions;" having a family to maintain, and talents to dispose of (*x*). He at the same time relinquished the pension, which he owed to his connection with Hamilton. Acting thus, like a wise man, who knew the world, and discerning the stage, on which he could act, Edmund Burke became private Secretary to the Marquis of Rockingham, as the first Lord of the Treasury, in July 1765. He soon after came into Parliament, wherein having greatly distinguished himself, he was equally noticed by the world. The place, he first represented in Parliament, was Wendover, through the recommendation of Lord Verney; with whom, on this occasion, commenced an intimacy, which other interests, in the end, converted into disagreement. Burke adhered, during every change of ministers, to the fortunes of the Mar-

(*x*) The Life of Burke, p. 69.

quis,

quis, whether adverse, or fortunate. Amidst the clash of parties, which succeeded the shifting of power, Burke produced several pamphlets, which at once showed the vigour of his mind, proved the utility of his talents, and strengthened his connections. In 1769, he published *his Observations on the present State of the Nation*; and the "Sentiments of an English Freholder (y) :". In May 1770, he gave out his "Thoughts on the Causes of the present Discontents," which Mrs. M^cAulay answered, as not being sufficiently democratical. He continued his exertions, gained great popularity, rose to high distinctions, in the state, became the object of general admiration, and died, on the 8th of July 1797, full of years, and crowned with honourable fame.

The task of writing the life of Edmund Burke has been already executed by abler pens. In giving this sketch, I had no other object, than, merely, to lay a proper foundation, for the superstructure of proofs, which I now propose to submit to the candid reader, that this uncommon person was not the writer of Junius's Letters.

He was early suspected, and is, at this day, confidently considered, as the real author of those well known political papers. In October 1771, there was a letter, under the signature of ZENO, addressed "to JUNIUS, alias Edmund, the Jesuit of St. Omers (z)." About the same time, he was more expressly charged, as the author, by a writer, who *did know the secret*.

(y) Anecdotes of Bowyer, p. 412.

(z) Gent. Mag., 1771, p. 457.

While the prosecutions were carrying on against the publishers of those libels, "The genuine Letters of Junius, to which are prefixed Anecdotes of the Author," were re-published, in a pamphlet, without the name of the printer, or bookseller. The internal evidence of these *prefatory anecdotes* demonstrate, that they were written by Junius himself. They exhibit his figures, and inaccuracies; his sophistry, and confidence; his vigour, and brilliancy: And, in the true spirit of *Philo-junius*, he is diligent to praise himself, "as the most eminent writer on politics, since the accession of the House of Brunswick." This is, certainly, one of the most artful, and audacious, publications, which the world has ever witnessed. The writer assumes, with his usual dexterity, that Edmund Burke was the Author, and calls him *Junius*, throughout the anecdotes, without once mentioning the name of Burke: But, the anecdote-writer gives an outline of his life. He mentions Burke's "Vindication of Natural Society;" he speaks of his "Origin of the Sublime;" he censures his "Considerations on the Causes of the present Discontents:" And, he thus, incidentally, detracts from the talents, and consistency, of Edmund Burke; adding, for the purpose of deception, what he knew to be untrue, "that though the style, and sentiment, of the following letters be imputed to one writer, the materials of information, with which they abound, were furnished by different hands. *Junius* is, in this view, a *JUNTO*."

The malignant artifice of these prefatory anecdotes, Edmund Burke had penetration enough to see: And, from what he saw, we may perceive the cause, why he

voluntarily

voluntarily disclaimed being the writer of Junius's Letters to the late Dr. Johnson; why he assured Sir William Draper, that he was not the author; why he spoke to Mr. C— B— about Junius, in *terms of disgust*. Add to these strong circumstances what seems to be a decisive proof: When the genuine edition of JUNIUS was published by H. S. Woodfall, in 1772, under the legitimate authority of the real author, the prefatory anecdotes of the prior edition, being no longer wanted, were entirely suppressed: This, then, is a virtual declaration of Junius himself, that Edmund Burke was not the author of Junius's Letters: And, we now perceive, that the *prefatory anecdotes*, which were intended to delude, are at length brought, instructively, to undeceive all those, who read for information, and amusement, rather than for cavil, and disputation.

Moreover, the internal evidence, whether we consider the style, or the sentiment, furnishes stronger proof. Burke, in his style, has his figures; but they are chaste, and correct. Junius too abounds in figures, without number, or correctness, or propriety. Burke would never have made Draper *repose* like Damiens, upon a bed of *torture*. Burke was a friend of government, by habit, and was only an oppositionist, by chance: Junius was an anarchist from nature, and study, and practice; nor could he write on politics, without inculcating revolutionary principles. And while Junius was writing thus democratically, Burke published his *Thoughts on the present Discontents*, which were avowed to be aristocratical; and which Junius censured, “ as having exposed the bare face of the
“ par-

“partisan (*a*).” Burke always spoke with veneration of the Marquis of Rockingham, constantly defended the principles of his administration, and adhered steadily to his party, while his party adhered to themselves: Junius spoke, contemptuously, of the Rockingham administration (*b*). Thus, were Burke, and Junius, as contrary to each other, as contraries can be: As government to anarchy; as aristocracy to democracy; as legislative regulation to seditious innovation. When Draper, like a gentleman, asked Burke, whether he were the author of Junius, Burke, like a man of sense, and spirit, told him, that he was not the author: Had he been conscious of guilt, he would have acted, as Junius said he did, with petulance, and impropriety, and defiance (*c*). None, but such a lampooner, as Mathias, would remain suspiciously silent, when he is charged with what degrades him, as a writer, and disgraces him as a man, if he were not conscious of guilt, and fearful of detection. Add to all those proofs a story, which the late Charles Townshend, one of the deputy Tellers of the Exchequer, used to repeat, namely, that he one day met Burke, in Bond-street, full of indignation; and, inquiring the cause, Burke said, that some good-natured friend had revived the report of his being the author of Junius. Wilkes, who received many letters from Junius, “scouted the notion of Mr. Burke being the” author of the epistles under that well-known fig-

(*a*) In his prefatory anecdotes.

(*b*) Gen. ed. vol. i. p. 172, &c.

(*c*) In the prefatory anecdotes.

“ nature (*d*).” After so many proofs, which carry conviction with them, it is unnecessary to repeat what Burke said, in parliament, with regard to Junius; because his speech was less grave, in its manner, than his private asseverations, and less conclusive, in its inferences, than his avowed sentiments.

—JOHN DUNNING, LORD ASHBURTON—

Was one of those singular men, who, by his talents, and success, as a lawyer, made great party connections; and by means of his party connections, obtained a peerage. He was appointed solicitor-general, in December 1767, and resigned his office, in March 1770; he was made chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster, in March 1782, and died in March 1783, at the age of fifty-three (*e*). Now; the proposition, with regard to this eminent man, and great lawyer, is, that he, being his Majesty’s solicitor-general, did, on the 19th of December 1769, write, and publish, a libellous letter, reviling the king’s government, insulting the king’s person, and impugning that fundamental principle of the British constitution, which insures the king’s impeccability. Of this position, such is the improbability, that it would require, to prove it, stronger evidence, than proofs of holy writ: Such is its absurdity, that it cannot be made more absurd by any argument, nor more ridiculous by any sarcasm.

(*d*) See Mr. C—B—’s letter in the Anti-Jacobin Rev. for July, p. 347.

(*e*) Gent. Mag. 1783, p. 717. There are also anecdotes of Lord Ashburton, in the European Mag. 1798, p. 81.

—JOHN

—JOHN ROBERTS.—

Of him, it used to be asserted, by the late Israel Maduit, who distinguished himself by his *Considerations on the German War*, and thought, because he knew much, that he knew every thing, that he was the writer of the Letters of Junius. Maduit used to assign, as his reason for that conjecture, what did little credit to his logic, that John Roberts, a man of talents, who had been connected with the Pelhams, died in 1772, six months after Junius had ceased to write, under that signature.

John Roberts, from being a clerk in the Treasury, became private secretary to Henry Pelham, the chancellor of the Exchequer, who died, in 1754. John Roberts came into parliament for Harwich, in 1761, and continued to represent this borough, during his life. He took his place at the Board of Trade, in October 1761, in the room of Andrew Stone; but, he was superseded, by the appointment of Lord Orwell, in December 1762: He was again appointed, by the recommendation of the old Duke of Newcastle, to the same place, on the 20th July 1765, in which he uninterruptedly continued till his decease, on the 13th of July 1772 (*f*).

(*f*) Court Reg.; Gent. Mag. 1772, p. 373. There is a monumental stone in Westminster Abbey, "To the memory of John Roberts, Esq; secretary to the Right Honourable Henry Pelham, minister of state to King George 2d. This marble was erected by his three surviving sisters, Susannah, Rebecca, and Dorothy, 1776." The Gentleman's Magazine, which records his death, will preserve his memory longer, than the pious marble of his grateful sisters.

The

The proposition, with regard to John Roberts, then, is, that he, being one of his Majesty's commissioners for the affairs of Trade and Plantations, did, on the 19th of December 1769, write a libellous letter, reviling the King's person, and insulting the King's government. Maduit, when he made his guess, neither recollected dates, nor regarded circumstances; neither did he advert, that Junius ceased to write, under that famous signature, in January 1772, and that John Roberts, who appears to have been an honest man, and a good subject, did not die till July in the same year (*g*). A conjecture, which violates probability, no one needs be ashamed to relinquish, nor afraid to disbelieve.

—CHARLES LLOYD—

Owed a learned education to Westminster, and to Cambridge; being admitted a scholar of St. Peter's, in 1749, at the age of fourteen, and elected to Cambridge, in 1754 (*h*). He thence passed, in the tract

(*g*) John Roberts of Albemarle-street left a will; whereof his two unmarried sisters, Susan, and Rebecca, were appointed the executrices. He bequeathed a thousand pounds to his cousin, John Hughson, partly from affection, and partly, for the trouble of sorting his papers, for the purpose of delivering those, which did not belong to the testator's affairs, to "his honoured patroness, Lady Catherine Pelham," to whom he bequeathed a gold repeating watch, that he thankfully acknowledged to have received by her hands. He devised his whole estate, real, and personal, to be equally divided among his four sisters.

(*h*) The List of the scholars of St. Peter's, p. 133—138.

of

of many an able man, into the Treasury, as a Clerk; and thence went into the Exchequer, as a Deputy Teller. He was, certainly, an ingenious person, who wrote several pamphlets, which are now forgotten, amidst a vast collection of political lucubrations, of meaner quality. He died intestate, on the 22d of January 1773 (i): And, on the 10th of July, administration of his effects was granted to his brother, the Reverend Doctor Philip Lloyd, the Dean of Norwich; his mother having previously relinquished her prior right.

Of Charles Lloyd it is said, that he was the writer of Junius's Letters; because there were found, by somebody, after his decease, among his papers, some documents, that discovered him to have been the writer of those Epistles; Epistles which required the attention of years, uncommon capacity, and peculiar habits to write; and which exposed him to the risque of ruin, without any adequate object.

With respect to him, the proposition, then, is, that a Clerk of the Treasury, and a Deputy Teller of the Exchequer, at the age of thirty-four, did compose Epistles, which reflected on the King's ministers, and reviled the King's person; that he intrigued, as a reformer, with Wilkes; and, as a politician, entangled himself in the inextricable mazes of City-politics. He, who hopes, that this story should be credited, would do well to remember, that gross improbabilities require the strongest proofs to satisfy a reasonable thinker.

(i) Gent. Mag. 1773, p. 48.

—SAMUEL DYER.—

Of this learned person, it is also said, that documents were found, after his decease, among his papers, which satisfied the finder, whoever he were, that Samuel Dyer was the writer of Junius's Letters. But, two contradictory propositions cannot both be true : If Charles Lloyd must be deemed the author, because papers were found in his repositories, which ascertained the fact, Samuel Dyer could not be the author : If Samuel Dyer must be deemed the author of Junius's Letters, because papers were found in his repositories, which ascertained the fact, Charles Lloyd could not be the author of the same mysterious Epistles.

Samuel Dyer was the son of a jeweller in the city of London, who rose to eminence, and wealth, by his industry. His parents, who were dissenters, early destined their son for the dissenting ministry. His more early education, he received from Professor Ward, and Doctor Dodderidge : He prosecuted his studies under Doctor Hutchinson, in the university of Glasgow, where he applied himself to metaphysics, and perused the Greek moralists. As Dr. Hutchinson died, as we have seen, in 1746, Dyer must, of course, have studied at Glasgow before that year. He, at length, repaired to Leyden, in order to read Hebrew under Schultens, the celebrated orientalist. At the end of two years, he returned to England, eminently skilled in the languages, ancient, and modern, a great mathematician, and an intelligent naturalist : Added to all these endowments, he had a temper so mild,

mild, and a conversation so modest, as to attract attention, and to gain esteem: Though he was a silent, rather than a talkative, person, he received many a summons, which he obeyed with the alacrity of a man of pleasure, rather than of a man of study, to dinners, and card-parties.

Dyer made no haste, however, to be a dissenting minister. During this state of hesitation, Doctor Chandler employed him, for a suitable reward, to translate into Latin the religious tracts of Doctor Daniel Williams, for the purpose of gratuitous distribution: But, Dyer had made little progress, before the task grew irksome; and the completing of the translation was put into a more industrious hand. Dyer showed, on this occasion, to his friends, that aversion from labour, which accompanied him through life. He now commenced a man of the world, whose company was courted, because his accomplishments were admired. On the 24th of April 1760, he was admitted a fellow of the Royal Society. Soon after the establishment of the *Literary Club*, in 1764, he became an associate with Johnson, Burke, and other eminent characters, of that period. From his admiration of a French book, entitled *Les Mœurs*, Dyer was induced to translate it into English, for Cave, the printer: Yet, his indolence could not be induced, by any motive, to complete his undertaking. He was now strongly pressed by Johnson, and his other literary friends, to write the life of Erasmus: But, his settled habits of inattention, to any serious employment, resisted every effort of friendly persuasion. He was, however, induced, by the entreaties of Sharp, the surgeon, to engage in a work of less labour,
the

the revision of the old translation of Plutarch's Lives, for which, having by an unusual effort of perseverance completed it, he received, from the liberality of Tonson and Draper, the booksellers, two hundred pounds. This effort seems to have greatly fatigued him; and he soon fell back into a deplorable state of helpless indolence. Yet, he was not disqualified from acting as a commissary to the troops in Germany, which he left in 1763, without the accumulation of a commissary's fortune.

For his maintenance, in this course of voluptuous idleness, he enjoyed, by the death of his relations, about £.8,000. in the public funds; which, after a while, he invested in the fluctuating stock of the East India Company. At the contested election, in April 1769, he tried, without success, to be chosen a Director of the great machine of this commercial corporation (*k*). He became a buyer of the public securities, on time, and violated his engagements: He entered into real bargains for stock, which, as he was obliged to fulfil them, at whatever loss, deprived him of his all. He was at last, probably, ruined by the well known fluctuations of the India Stock (*l*). Soon after the completion of his ruin, he was seized with a quinsy: Yet, Sir John Hawkins leaves it doubtful, whether he were killed by it, or killed himself (*m*). He certainly died

(*k*) Gent. Mag. p. 211.

(*l*) Ib. 297.

(*m*) Life of Johnson.

on the 15th of September 1772 (*n*). "He left not," says his biographer, "in money, or effects, sufficient to defray the expence of a decent funeral; and the last office of humanity towards him was performed by one of those who had been accessary to his ruin (*o*)."
The records of the Prerogative Office, which I have searched, seem to confirm Hawkins's averment: for, no will of Samuel Dyer, was found; but, the administration of his effects was granted to Lord Verney, a creditor, at the end of four months after his decease.

Yet; this inefficient scholar is said by some persons, who knew not his idle habits; to have been the writer of the Letters of the active Junius; a task, which required the greatest activity, and vigour; which shew extraordinary exertions of intellect, and uncommon flashes of genius. The story is, that the late Sir Joshua Reynolds, being the executor of Samuel Dyer, found some documents, among the testator's papers, which convinced the fictitious executor, of an unrecorded will, that the inactive Dyer wrote the Epistles of the enterprizing Junius (*p*). A tale, which is thus shown

(*n*) Gent. Mag., 1772, p. 439.—Died, in Castle Street, Leicester Fields, to the unspeakable loss of his friends, the learned and worthy Samuel Dyer, Esq; F. R. S. [Ann. Reg. p. 168.]

(*o*) Sir J. Hawkins's Life of Johnson.

(*p*) The fact is, that on the 13th of January 1773, administration to the estate of Samuel Dyer, late of St. Martin in the Fields, was granted to the Right Honourable Ralph Earl Verney, a creditor by bond; William Cooley, Anne Cades, widow, Elizabeth Lane, the wife of William Lane, Mary Pynsent, spinster, and

shown to be false, in its principal incident, would not deserve much credit, if it were better supported by proof. Sir Joshua Reynolds, certainly, used to say, that Samuel Dyer was the writer of Junius's *Epistles* (q). But, whether Sir Joshua formed his opinion from the general character of Dyer, which would lead to a different inference, or from special intimations, which would conduct us to a just conclusion, does not appear: Neither are we, distinctly, informed why Dyer smarted under the new administration of the Duke of Grafton, when Burke, and greater men than Burke, were removed from power, in August 1766. If the rejection of Dyer, as a Director of the India Company, be the supposed smart, it would not follow very logically,

and Johanna Cock, the wife of John Cock, the cousins, and next of kin, having first renounced. It is said by Mr. C. B. "that on Dyer's decease, who is now suspected of being the Author of Junius's Letters, the Burkes showed infinite anxiety to get his papers into their hands; as Mr. C. B. had heard." [Anti-Jacobin Rev. for July, 349.] From knowing that Lord Verney was the administrator of Samuel Dyer, we may easily infer, that William and Richard Burke may have had a very different reason, for wishing to see the papers of the intestate, than mere curiosity about the writer of Junius's Letters.

(q) On this subject, my intelligent friend, before mentioned, has written to me as follows: "I must assure you, that I frequently heard my most excellent friend, Sir Joshua Reynolds say, that Mr. Samuel Dyer wrote Junius. Dyer was an extraordinary man; learned, sagacious, sarcastic in his manner, of almost imitable silence in conversation, full of observation and penetration. At this time, he smarted under the new administration of the Duke of Grafton, when Burke, &c. was turned out: Dyer lived with Burke chiefly, and was Burke's assistant in matters of calculation. Certainly Junius was written by some mortified man."

that a subsequent injury could be the rational cause of a preceding attack: Junius began his Epistles in January 1769; and Dyer was rejected in April 1769. If that be true, for which there is rational authority, that Samuel Dyer was the intimate friend of Edmund Burke (*r*), this circumstance would prove, that Dyer did not write the letters of Junius: For, the principles of Burke and Junius stood opposed to each other: Junius, it has been shown, spoke contemptuously of the Rockingham administration: and, Burke used to speak with indignant scorn of Junius: Dyer could have supplied more erudition, and science, than Junius possessed. But, though Dyer could, certainly, have avoided the boyish blunders of Junius, he could not have attained to his dexterities of sophistry, and figures of diction, even if he had been master of the activity of enterprize, and vigour of effort, which characterize the writings of our celebrated libellist. In litigious, and in fair, discussions, a paper, which is quoted as an authority, must be produced, in evidence, before it can be admitted in proof: And, therefore, the persons, who speak of the papers, which were found in Dyer's repositories, and which would establish his pretensions, as the true writer of Junius's Letters, ought to lay them before the public.

In making inquiries about Samuel Dyer, I have found gueffers, who have confounded him with the Reverend John Dyer, who wrote the *Fleece*, and other poems; and, who died, in July 1758. If there were

(*r*) We have seen how affectionately the Annual Register spoke of Samuel Dyer, after his death.

any other Dyer, than Samuel, who was in the least likely to be the Author of Junius, I should, in the course of my research, have discovered, in the literary journals, one, who could not fail to appear, in every place, with his appropriate glare.

—JOHN WILKES—

Among other conjectures, which prejudice has made, and credulity has believed, with regard to the Author of Junius's Letters, suspicion has mentioned this well known character.

John Wilkes was born, on the 27th of October 1727, the son of a distiller, in St. John Street, Islington-road, who, by a life of diligence, raised himself to wealth, and respectability. His earliest connections were among the dissenters; his mother being a dissenter, and his school-master a dissenting minister. Before he was three and twenty, he married Miss Mead, who was a dozen years older than himself, and who was also a dissenter, with a considerable fortune. Soon after his marriage, he settled at Aylesbury, where he cultivated letters, and practised hospitality, with very little benefit to his fortune. But, as they were all dissenters together, in principle, and in practice, this union ended in separation.

He first emerged from privacy, in 1754, when he offered himself to the electors of Berwick-upon-Tweed, as their parliamentary representative. It is curious to observe, that even thus early he began to cant about *the cause of liberty*, without carrying his election. He obtained a commission in the Buckinghamshire

militia, when it was first embodied, He became a member of a notorious club at Mednamham, in the same county. And, having deranged his affairs, by every mode of dissipation; he tried expedients for raising money, which, his biographer fears, would not bear a strict examination.

With the opening of a new reign; new prospects dawned on John Wilkes. He was returned as a burgess, for Aylesbury, to the parliament, which assembled in November 1761. He was prompted by his necessities to offer himself, as governor for Canada; but without success: He proposed to go as ambassador to Constantinople; without obtaining his end. And, he now, therefore, wrote his *Observations on the Papers relative to the Rupture with Spain*. On the 2d of June 1762, he began, with the aid of various coadjutors, to publish the *North Briton*; a publication, which was the source of his celebrity, and misfortunes, and the cause of his ultimate independence, and final repose. For the personal obloquy, which was cast, by the *North Briton*, on individuals, he was challenged by individuals: For his libellous offences against the public, he was prosecuted by informations, in Westminster-Hall, and by expulsion from the House of Commons. He endeavoured to retaliate, by prosecuting all those, who had been instrumental in prosecuting him. He was, however, obliged to seek for refuge in France. And he was, thereupon, outlawed, as a criminal, who had fled from the justice of his country.

His necessities compelled him to return to England, in 1766, with hopes which were, unexpectedly, disappointed. His disappointments drove him back
to

to Paris. Despair, at length, urged him to adopt the desperate measure of defying the laws, and braving the legislature: So, in February 1768, he came to London; and soon after offered himself, as a candidate, to represent that city in parliament. His want of success did not discourage him from offering himself as a representative to the freeholders of Middlesex, who chose him by a great majority: But, this choice, which occasioned so many events, and so much controversy, did not prevent him from being arrested on a *capias utlagatum*; and from being, thereupon, committed to the King's Bench prison, on the 27th of April 1768. On the 18th of June, he was sentenced, on the two verdicts, which had been given against him, for publishing the North Briton, and the Essay on Woman, to be imprisoned two and twenty months, to pay two fines, each of five hundred pounds, and to find security for his good behaviour, during seven years. In the mean time, he obtained a reversal of his outlawry, and a verdict against the secretary, and under-secretary of state, for arresting him, on such general warrants, as had been always used. His fortunes, and misfortunes, were now balanced, in nearly equal scales. On the 27th of January 1769, he was chosen an alderman of London; on the 3d of February, he was expelled the House of Commons: On the 16th of February he was re-elected; and on the subsequent day, he was again expelled: On the 16th of March he was a third time elected; and on the succeeding day, he was a third time expelled. At the fourth election, Colonel Luttrell appeared as his opponent, probably,

on a concerted plan; and, Mr. Wilkes being returned by a great majority, the House of Commons, as the judicature of ultimate jurisdiction, on the subject of elections, determined, that the eligible person, was duly chosen, although he had the smaller number of legal votes, in opposition to an ineligible person, who had the greater number of votes, which, as thus given, were deemed illegal and inapplicable. This decision occasioned a controversy of a dozen years, which was, at length, ended by a compromise of party.

The time was now come, when the champion of liberty was himself to be free. On the 18th of April 1770, he regained his freedom; and took his place among the aldermen. But, enjoyment is seldom tasted without alloy. When the government ceased to prosecute him, he was persecuted by his friends. An acrimonious controversy, between him and his former supporter, Mr. Horne, for some time exposed the partizans, and amused the town. It required the election of three successive years to obtain the office of Lord Mayor. He, indeed, took his seat in the House of Commons, as representative of Middlesex, without an objection; because there now was none. He, at last found, that prosperity enfeebled his power, in the same proportion, as adversity had given him strength. For the office of Chamberlain of the City, alderman Hopkins far out-voted him, on every trial. On the death of that respectable magistrate, in 1779, Mr. Wilkes obtained the office, which, as he executed it with fidelity, and diligence,

made

made him easy all his life. He died, on the 26th of December 1797, aged seventy years (*s*).

Among the various, and dissimilar, characters, whom presumption conjectured, to be the writer of the letters of *Junius*, was Wilkes, who was, mean time, a prisoner, and occupied with a thousand intrigues, squabbles, and pursuits. It is a fact, which goes far towards deciding the question, that Wilkes was a prisoner in the King's Bench, before *Junius* began to write, and for fifteen months afterwards: But, the free air of *Junius* was a sufficient indication, that he was "a chartered libertine." We must, also, suppose, in compliance with that conjecture, that Wilkes had one altercation in the newspapers, with Mr. Horne, as Wilkes, and another, with Mr. Horne, as *Junius*. We must, moreover, ridiculously suppose, that Wilkes corresponded with Wilkes. For, the patriot received many letters from *Junius*, the originals of which are said to remain, in Miss Wilkes's hands (*t*). An intelligent person, who lived in great intimacy with Wilkes, from 1776 to 1784, says in evidence, that "Far from giving the least hint, that he was the author of *Junius's* Letters, he always explicitly

(*s*) There is in the *European Magazine*, 1798, p. 17-85-163, a good account of John Wilkes, Esq. from which this sketch is, chiefly, compiled. The only defect of it is, that it does not give the names of his father, and mother.

(*t*) See the *Anti-Jacobin Review* for July, p. 346-7-8.—And see the *Gentleman's Magazine* 1771, p. 584, for a singular letter "presented by John Wilkes Esq. to the Supporters of the Bill of Rights, as the observations of the celebrated *Junius*." See the same letter in a new edition of the *Letters of Junius*, 1789, p. 368. and see it re-published in the genuine edition, v. 2. p. 351.

dis-

“disclaimed it, and treated it, as a ridiculous supposition. No one acquainted with his style can suspect, for a moment, that he was the author of them; the merit of his style was simplicity; he had both gaiety and strength; but, to the rancorous sarcasms, the lofty contempt, with which Junius’s Letters abound, no one was a greater stranger than Mr. Wilkes. To this may be added, the very slighting manner, in which Junius expresses himself of Mr. Wilkes. I am willing to admit, that if Mr. Wilkes had written Junius’s Letters, he would have treated Mr. Wilkes uncivilly for the sake of disguising himself: But, sneer, and, particularly, that kind of sneer, which Mr. Wilkes, occasionally, receives from Junius, you may be assured, Mr. Wilkes would never have used in speaking of himself (u).”

I have

(u) See the remarks of Mr. C. B. on *Junius’s Letters* in the *Anti-Jacobin Review*, p. 346-349.—I will subjoin an anecdote, which some readers will regard as still more decisive evidence. I have now before me Mr. Wilkes’s edition of *Junius’s Letters*, with MS. notes, which were written with his own hand. The first note is, “This edition is imperfect and incorrect. It was printed by Dryden Leach.” Mr. Wilkes corrected the typographical errors with his own pen. His notes are neither many, nor important. The following passage in Junius’s ninth letter, dated the 10th of April 1769, when Mr. Wilkes was in *durance*, he has underlined. “But, let Mr. Wilkes’s character be what it may, this at least is certain, that circumstanced as he is, with regard to the public, even his vices plead for him.” Mr. Horne had said, in one of his letters to Junius: “Had I lived in those times [the days of Charles the First] I would not have waited for chance to give me an opportunity of doing my duty; I would have sought him through the ranks, and without the least personal enmity, have discharged my
“piece

I have heard it said, that one of the bishops, and that one of the judges, wrote Junius's Letters: I have been told, that A. B. C. and D. are the enigmatical signatures of the true author: But, I have not undertaken the endless task of proving, that the letters of *the cross row* do not stand for the initials of the writer of Junius's Epistles. It is sufficient for me, to deny the affirmation, which attributes the writing of such lampoons to such personages, as A. B. C. and D. He who is so presumptuous as to state such absurd improbabilities, as indubitable truths, ought to establish his position by the strongest proofs: For, the mind naturally rejects improbabilities, in favour of what is probable. It must be apparent to all, who are capable of reasoning, that the confident assertions before-mentioned, as to particular persons, being each the true author of Junius's Letters, are destroyed by such contradictory affirmations, which are all of equal positiveness: For, there can be but one truth; and what is true, with regard to the first person, assigned as the writer of Junius's Epistles, must be necessarily false, as to the last; as what is true with regard to John Wilkes, the last person, must be false, in respect to Lord Sackville, the first imputed author. I will knit

"piece into his bosom *rather* than into any other man's." On this passage, Mr. Wilkes wrote the following observation: "Mr. Horne copied this from a MS. marginal note in Mr. Wilkes's *Clarendon*." We, hereby, see how readily Mr. Wilkes reclaimed his own. Had Junius, when he was hard pressed, for an answer to Mr. Horne, known this to be a plagiarism, how he would have triumphed over his too-powerful antagonist!

up the loop of this argument, by a remark of Sir John Davies :

- " Perhaps something, repugnant to her kind,
- " By strong antipathy, the soul may kill ;
- " But, what can be *contrary* to the mind,
- " Which holds all *contraries* in *concord* still !

SECONDLY : From the negative argument, which exhibits *contraries*, destroying each other, by their *antipathies*, as the effects of poison are destroyed by its antidote, I now proceed, in the second place, to prove my affirmative position.

The mystery, which has covered this secret, for thirty years, was raised partly by artifice, and partly by scepticism. Junius himself, with characteristic artifice, attributed, as we have seen, to Edmund Burke, the writing of his own lampoons. Various persons, who thought well, no doubt, of their own powers of perception, attributed the writing of them to others, who were eminent for rank, or distinguished for literature. The slightest circumstances were caught at ; in order to establish conjectures, which would never have been made, if facts had been ascertained, if deductions had been weighed, and if common sense had been consulted by self-sufficiency. The supposition, that the author was a man of rank, I have shown to be improbable. The notion, that the author was a great lawyer, I have proved to be groundless (*x*). The
assump-

(*x*) In Junius's Preface [p. xii.] to the corrected edition of his Letters, the author says, for the purpose of deception : " I am no
" lawyer by profession, nor do I pretend to be more deeply read
" than

assumption, that the author was a profound scholar, I have also shown to be extremely problematical (y).

There is, indeed, a double sophism, with which scholarship has long deluded itself, and the world. It has been said, and seldom contradicted, that Junius is the greatest writer, who ever was, or ever will be; and it has been also said, that Hugh M'Aulay Boyd wrote without knowledge, and without style. By thus elevating too much the one scale, and depressing too much the other, the equipoise of truth is lost. It becomes, therefore, necessary, to restore a proper balance, by taking from, or adding to, either scale, as will best fix the certainty of truth between them.

Johnson was not the first, who objected to the composition of Junius, as inaccurate in its figures, and inefficacious in its points. "Though I cannot think the style of Junius free from criticism," says that philologist, "though his expressions are often trite, and his periods feeble, I should never have stationed him, where he has placed himself, had I not rated him by his morals, rather than his faculties (z)." There were other men of eminence, who did not *think*

"than every English gentleman should be in the laws of his country. If therefore the principles I maintain are truly constitutional, I shall not think myself answered, though I should be convicted of a mistake in terms, or of misapplying the language of the law." The fact is, that he was, at that epoch, only a student of law: For, he was not called to the Irish bar, till Easter-term, 1776.

(y) "His learning," says his biographer, "like his genius, was more splendid, than profound."

(z) Falkland Islands, p. 124, of Johnson's Political Tracts.

the

the style of Junius free from criticism. We now have it, in evidence, that Mr. Gibbon did not admire his style, as much as it was admired in general; "and he told me, says Mr. C. B. that Mr. Fox thought "slightingly of it (*a*)."
Mr. Wilkes had the discernment to observe, "that there was, from time to time, a visible improvement in the style of Junius (*b*)," though he did not perceive, that the defects arose not so much from the inexperience of age, as from the imbecility of youth. It was reserved for me, in my humble pursuits, to produce the examples of inaccuracy, which, probably, induced such men to *speak slightingly of the style of Junius.*

As a proof of my position, I have already produced a dozen examples of bad English from one epistle. This proof has not been controverted. The *Phil-Junius's* of the present day turn off from examples, which they know not how to confute; and recur to the common sophistry of re-asserting what has been disproved, without adverting to the proofs of the previous confutation. Yes, indeed, one critic does allege, that a dozen blunders, in one epistle, do not prove a celebrated author to be an inaccurate writer. But, there are readers, on whom examples of false grammar, will work conviction: And, to them, I submit it, additionally, that the preface to the *corrected* edition of Junius contains a dozen blunders in the

(*a*) See the Letter of Mr. C—B—, in the Anti-Jacobin Rev. July 348.

(*b*) lb. 347.

construction of the English language (*c*).—Unless prejudice be too strong to admit conviction, it must at last be allowed, that Junius is an inaccurate writer. If he be an inaccurate writer, he ought not to be quoted as an English classic, whatever Mathias may say; nor can he be the greatest writer, whatever critics may dogmatise.

Having, therefore, deducted something from the scale of Junius, I will now add something to the scale of M'Aulay. There are three works, which were, undoubtedly, written by Hugh M'Aulay Boyd; and which are before the public: *The Freeholder*, which was published, at Belfast, in 1776; *The Whig*, which was printed, in the London newspapers, in 1779; and *The Observer*, which was published, periodically, at Madras, in 1793-4. Whoever peruses these publications, with the least attention, must perceive, that

(*c*) (1) "Preface" should have the article *the* preceding it, according to the rule, whatever inattentive writers may scribble, or dogmatists, may say. (2) "Good men appear to me to consult their piety, as little as their judgment." [judgments.] (3) "*Both* minister and magistrate is [are] compelled"—(4) between his duty [their duties] and *his* reputation [their reputations] (5) "If he agreed [had agreed] in opinion, his discourse was impertinent." [had been impertinent.] (6) "What hardships he imposes on his fellow-subject" [fellow-subjects.] (7-8) We are told that judge and jury have a distinct "office;" that [the] judge and [the] jury have distinct offices. (9) "That the jury *is* to find the fact;—the jury *are* undoubtedly to determine the fact; The substantive jury cannot be both singular, and plural: And when the jury *have* received *their* charge.—(10-11) "If, in the course of the trial, any question of law *arises* [arise]:—If I am [be] not grossly mistaken." (12) "*Elder* sons," for *eldest* sons.—(13) "National reflections, I confess, are not *justified* [justifiable] in theory, nor upon any general principles."

there

there are but few men, who can write lucubrations of such vigour, and elegance. I protest against the judgments of those critics, who *opine*, without perusing what they either praise, or defame. Hugh M'Aulay, who could thus write, what few men can write, must be allowed to have been a person of uncommon powers. I do not say, that there is much matter in any of those acknowledged works of his: But, what matter is there in Junius? They do not display, indeed, much learning: But, what learning has Junius? M'Aulay's writings have, in common with Junius, facility, and elegance, (if elegance and inaccuracy can exist together,) confidence, and vigour, numerous figures, which are not always consistently used, and abundant finery, which does not fitly adorn what it was meant to dignify. The supposition, that M'Aulay wrote Junius's Letters, is not, then, "too absurd for discussion;" as that commentator conceived, who gave an opinion, from knowing the person of M'Aulay Boyd, without having perused his productions (*d*); like a lawyer, who should rather look at his client's face, than his client's brief, when he is about to give his professional opinion: The absurdity, therefore, was not so much in me, who had studied the character of M'Aulay, and perused his *Freeholder*, his *Whig*, and his *Observer*, as in those, who *laughed at the idea of* M'Aulay being the writer of Junius's Epistles, without reading what he had written, or knowing his character.

Of Hugh M'Aulay, who is thus, oppositely, held

(*d*) Anti-Jacobin Rev. for July, p. 348-9.

up,

up, curiosity must wish to know a little more. He was the second son of Alexander M'Aulay of the county of Antrim, in Ireland, a barrister of a small estate, by the eldest daughter of Hugh Boyd of Ballycastle, in the same shire, who is still remembered, in his country, for having, by his industry, his prudence, and his sagacity, amassed a considerable estate; and is recorded, in the journals of the Irish parliament, as the person who obtained considerable sums from the mistaken munificence of the Irish Commons, for constructing the harbour of Ballycastle (e).

Alexander M'Aulay rose to notice by his diligence of application, rather than his knowledge of law, by the steadiness of his perseverance, more than the brilliancy of his oratory. He was made one of the king's counsel at law, for the kingdom of Ireland, whilst that distinction was more coveted, because it was less common than it is at present: And, he was appointed the judge of the consistory court; a promotion, which he had amply earned by his vigorous defence of ecclesiastical rights. In early life, he had distinguished himself by his political treatises: But, the first of his pamphlets, which attracted much public notice, was "*Property Inviolable*," published about the year 1737. In this tract, which displayed the determined spirit of the man, he exposed, and reprobated, the proceedings of the Irish Commons, who arrogated to

(e) There is, in the 7th vol. of the Irish Journals, p. 501-42, an interesting report on that expensive work, which was intended to supply Dublin with cheap coal; but which terminated, only, in the improvement, and increase of Mr. Boyd's private fortune.

themselves the right of deciding upon the clergy's title to the *tithe of agistment*, by a vote of their house alone. Neither Hampden, who opposed the ship-money of a King, nor Stowell of Exeter, who stood upon his defence against the arbitrary imprisonments of a House of Commons, at a factious epoch, deserve greater celebration, for their magnanimous defence of national liberty, than M'Aulay highly merited, for his undaunted firmness, in defending the undoubted rights of the clergy, against proceedings, which were unwarranted by any principle of the constitution, and indefensible by any maxim of the law of the land. M'Aulay showed, very distinctly, that the House of Commons, by a parity of proceeding, might equally attempt, to vote down the whole church of Ireland (f). By this great service, M'Aulay obtained the hearts of the clergy, and gained the soul of Dean Swift. A vacancy in parliament, for the university of Dublin, soon after happened: M'Aulay offered himself to represent that learned body, in opposition to Philip Tisdal, a lawyer, who rose by his talents, and merit, to be attorney-general, a privy counsellor, and the Irish secretary of state. Swift obtained for M'Aulay, by means of Sir George Lyttelton, the active influence of the Prince of Wales, the chancellor of that university (g): Dr. Baldwin, the provost of Trinity college, supported him, who had supported the church: And, M'Aulay carried his election, by a majority of one.

(f) See the Irish Journ. vol. 6. p. 658.—Boulter's Letters, vol. 2. passim, on the point.

(g) Swift's Letter, dated 5th June 1739.

Tisdal, however, petitioned the House of Commons, from whom M'Aulay could hope for little fairness, and for no favour, as he had, particularly, offended the Speaker, Boyle: And, he was of course voted out, as unduly chosen (*b*). Whether Hugh M'Aulay remembered his father's wrong, at a subsequent day, I will not conjecture: Certain it is, that the father was obliged to purchase a seat in the House of Commons, since he could not obtain a respectable one by suffrage. He took an active part in the business of parliament: He was deemed "a formal, phlegmatic, "monotonous speaker;" but was respected, as a sensible, well-informed man: What he, no doubt, deemed a greater honour, than his seat in the House of Commons, yet awaited him: In 1740, Dean Swift bequeathed him, in terms of the warmest affection, and, indeed, in expressions most flattering to his talents, and virtues, the gold box, in which the freedom of the city of Dublin had been presented to himself.

Alexander M'Aulay preserved his importance, because he continued his exertions, till his death. As the King's learned counsel, he published, in 1763, "An Enquiry into the Legality of Pensions on the "Irish Establishment:" He concludes his *impeachment of pensions*, by exclaiming: "If such pensions be "found on the Irish establishment; let such be cut "off; and let the perfidious advisers be branded with "indelible characters of public infamy, adequate, "if possible, to the dishonour of their crime."—M'Aulay, who had been all his life an opponent of

(*b*) Irish Com. Journ. 7 vol. p. 110.

the English government of Ireland, changed his tone, during the Earl of Hertford's administration: And, "finding an author *under the mask of patriotism*, had "lately published a pamphlet of evil tendency," M'Aulay sent forth, in January 1766, "Septennial Parliaments vindicated," which he addressed to the Lord Lieutenant. He had not, however, the satisfaction of living to see the establishment of octennial parliaments, which took place, during the administration of Lord Townshend. He died, after a laborious life of professional duties, on the 13th of July, 1766; leaving two sons, and two daughters, who had all been assiduously educated by two very capable parents (i): His eldest son Alexander, who had been bred to the bar, settled on the family estate of Glenville,

(i) Gent. Mag. 1766, p. 343. "Died, Alexander M'Aulay, "M. P. for Thomaston." My inquiries at Dublin have ascertained the identity of the deceased, who was thus described. I will add an anecdote or two of Alexander M'Aulay, from the information of a most respectable man, who remembers, very distinctly, the occurrences of those times, in Ireland: M'Aulay once spoke, for three days, in a Chancery cause, to the great annoyance of old Lord Bowes, the Chancellor.—When the parliament was to be prorogued, in 1766, M'Aulay, hearing, that Dr. Lucas intended to make an inflammatory motion, on the last day of the session, came early into the House, with the design to disappoint him. The moment the Speaker took the chair, M'Aulay got up, saying that, as he understood the order of the day to be the state of the nation, he would, with the leave of the House, run over the state of the nation, from the invasion of Henry the Second, to the present day. Dr. Lucas seeing himself circumvented, interrupted him indignantly: But, the Speaker decided in favour of M'Aulay. The Doctor broke out half a dozen times: But, the Speaker always put him down, by saying, that the gentleman on the floor, must be allowed

ville, and married the sister of Lord Gosford; his second son is the memorable object of the present inquiry: One of the daughters married Mr. Adair, a relation of the late serjeant; the other daughter married John Godley of the county of Armagh, Esq; and is, according to the observation of my intelligent informant, "a lady, highly gifted, and accomplished."

Such was the father of Hugh M'Aulay, who was born, on the 16th of April 1746, a day, which will always be memorable, in our annals, for the decisive battle of Culloden field. Dublin, which had produced an USHER, and a BURKE, has also the honour of giving birth to Hugh M'Aulay, at his father's house, in Ship-street. His father, as I have already shown, from good authority, was extremely attentive to the education of his children. Hugh himself used to say "that he was put very young to school, and "soon became much attached to books (*k*)" But, the Metamorphoses of Ovid first struck his attention, and best amused his infancy, as this poet had amused the childhood of Milton, and had attracted the notice of Ruddiman. He felt no ambition, like them, to display his premature scholarship, by making Latin verses; and from my inquiries at Dublin, I am led to believe, that he did not copy the example of

allowed to make his motion. At the end of an hour and a half, the Black Rod put an end to the speech; and the Parliament.—On the 5th of November 1771, Doctor Lucas died. The corporation of Dublin settled a pension of fifty pounds a year on his widow. [Gent. Mag. 1772, p. 42.] But, M'Aulay, the opponent of pensions, was now dead!

(*k*) Life by his Editor.

the English government of Ireland, changed his tone, during the Earl of Hertford's administration: And, "finding an author *under the mask of patriotism*, had "lately published a pamphlet of evil tendency," M'Aulay sent forth, in January 1766, "Septennial Parliaments vindicated," which he addressed to the Lord Lieutenant. He had not, however, the satisfaction of living to see the establishment of octennial parliaments, which took place, during the administration of Lord Townshend. He died, after a laborious life of professional duties, on the 13th of July, 1766; leaving two sons, and two daughters, who had all been assiduously educated by two very capable parents (i): His eldest son Alexander, who had been bred to the bar, settled on the family estate of Glenville,

(i) Gent. Mag. 1766, p. 343. "Died, Alexander M'Aulay, "M. P. for Thomaston." My inquiries at Dublin have ascertained the identity of the deceased, who was thus described. I will add an anecdote or two of Alexander M'Aulay, from the information of a most respectable man, who remembers, very distinctly, the occurrences of those times, in Ireland: M'Aulay once spoke, for three days, in a Chancery cause, to the great annoyance of old Lord Bowes, the Chancellor.—When the parliament was to be prorogued, in 1766, M'Aulay, hearing, that Dr. Lucas intended to make an inflammatory motion, on the last day of the session, came early into the House, with the design to disappoint him. The moment the Speaker took the chair, M'Aulay got up, saying that, as he understood the order of the day to be the state of the nation, he would, with the leave of the House, run over the state of the nation, from the invasion of Henry the Second, to the present day. Dr. Lucas seeing himself circumvented, interrupted him indignantly: But, the Speaker decided in favour of M'Aulay. The Doctor broke out half a dozen times: But, the Speaker always put him down, by saying, that the gentleman on the floor, must be allowed

ville, and married the sister of Lord Gosford; his second son is the memorable object of the present inquiry: One of the daughters married Mr. Adair, a relation of the late serjeant; the other daughter married John Godley of the county of Armagh, Esq; and is, according to the observation of my intelligent informant, "a lady, highly gifted, and accomplished."

Such was the father of Hugh M'Aulay, who was born, on the 16th of April 1746, a day, which will always be memorable, in our annals, for the decisive battle of Culloden field. Dublin, which had produced an USHER, and a BURKE, has also the honour of giving birth to Hugh M'Aulay, at his father's house, in Ship-street. His father, as I have already shown, from good authority, was extremely attentive to the education of his children. Hugh himself used to say "that he was put very young to school, and "soon became much attached to books (*k*)" But, the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid first struck his attention, and best amused his infancy, as this poet had amused the childhood of Milton, and had attracted the notice of Ruddiman. He felt no ambition, like them, to display his premature scholarship, by making Latin verses; and from my inquiries at Dublin, I am led to believe, that he did not copy the example of

allowed to make his motion. At the end of an hour and a half, the Black Rod put an end to the speech; and the Parliament.—On the 5th of November 1771, Doctor Lucas died. The corporation of Dublin settled a pension of fifty pounds a year on his widow. [*Gent. Mag.* 1772, p. 42.] But, M'Aulay, the opponent of pensions, was now dead!

(*k*) Life by his Editor.

Pope, in trying to gratify his father, by composing English rhymes. But, it is a fact, which is more important to state, that his father, "who laboured anxiously his education, and fondly saw in his budding parts the promise of a copious harvest, sometimes censured his son's PROSE, for being too POETICAL, and prescribed, as a model to him, the chaste style of Swift, and Addison; "that he might learn" (to use the old man's own words) "to combine the strength and precision of the one, with the simplicity and easy elegance of the other (1)." The seeds, however, of poetic imagery, which Nature had scattered in M'Auley's mind, never ripened into a harvest of poetry. He was educated at the school of the Reverend William Ball, in Ship-street, before mentioned; a school, which, among other distinguished scholars, and characters, sent forth Lord Clare, and Henry Grattan; who, being nearly of the same age, were of the same class, with Hugh M'Aulay; and yet remained a year behind him in Ship-street.

The step from the school to the college forms an important epoch in the biography of youth. Our student "was received, as a fellow commoner, into the university of Dublin, by the name of Hugh M'Aulay, on the 8th of July 1761 (m)." Here,

(1) From the letter of my very well informed correspondent at Dublin.

(m) I learned this important fact from the obliging information of the Rev. Doctor George Hall of Trinity College Dublin: And this fact proves, that our student still, at that time, passed by his father's name; and shows, incidentally, that the story of Hugh M'Aulay being always called Boyd, which is told by some intelligent men in Ireland, is unfounded.

he is said, by his biographer, to have pursued his favourite studies, with assiduity, and delight: He *certainly acquitted himself with credit*, as I have been assured by a class-fellow of our student, in the same college. He obtained his Batchelor of Arts degree, in 1765. He thus continued long enough, in Trinity College, to be *highly cultivated*, and to possess *considerable talents*, as I have been told by the same learned, and discerning, class-fellow of his. He could not well be otherwise from his natural endowments. He had a *memory of singular strength*; he had an apprehension of great readiness; an intellect of uncommon solidity; and besides all those faculties, he enjoyed a wonderful dexterity, in applying them to every purpose: The characteristic precision, with which he carried off the speeches of the greatest orators, is alone a satisfactory proof, that he enjoyed all those powers, in a high degree: And it is a strong confirmation of this reasoning, that he was a good chess-player, and made a stand against Count BRUHL.

Like other young men of powerful minds, and irregular practices, he remained, for some time, in suspense, about the choice of his profession. He inclined, for a while, to prefer the sword to the gown; as his eldest brother Alexander had already entered himself of the Temple. After some consideration, he determined, however, from the propensities of his habit, to follow the profession of his father. In the meantime, Hugh M'Aulay, owing to his passion for play, and dissipation, became involved, as we are told by his

biographer, "in great pecuniary difficulties, at the age
" of nineteen [1765.]" (n).

With all those embarrassments, practices, and habits, he came to London, before the decease of his father, on the 13th of July 1766 (o); in order to prosecute the study of the law (p). But, the propensities of our student carried him as often to St. Stephen's Chapel, as to Westminster Hall: He used frequently to retire from a long debate to *the Grecian* " [coffee house], where he met his fellow Templars; " and would sometimes astonish them by a seemingly " perfect recital of the *chef d'œuvre* of the night (q)." He is, at this time, described by another lawyer, who knew him personally, " as a good-natured, lively, man, " famous for repeating [parliamentary] speeches; and

(n) The Preface to the Indian Observer, p. xvi.

(o) I think it more than probable, that the notice of the death of his father, which appears, in the Gentleman's Magazine, was communicated by Hugh M'Aulay, who was, at the time, near the Editor, in London.

(p) It is supposed by some very well-informed lawyers, at Dublin, that Hugh M'Aulay-Boyd *was called to the Bar, in England*. But, it is a fact, which I state upon the credit of a very careful search of the Registers, belonging to the four Inns of Court, that he was never entered in any of the Inns, by either of his names of M'Aulay, or of Boyd. This is a curious circumstance in itself; and shows clearly, how much preferable circumstantial evidence is to the exceeding fallibility of human testimony. It is sufficiently known, with what accuracy those Registers are kept: and, it follows of course, that M'Aulay-Boyd *was never called to the Bar, in England*.

(q) From the information of a lawyer of great eminence at Dublin, who was, at that time, a templar with M'Aulay.

" always

"always bustling about something or another(*r*)."
 As to his *politics*; M'Aulay, partly from the place of his birth, partly from the example of his father, partly from his natural temperament, and partly from the factiousness of the times, was an Anarchist, if we may consider his avowed writings, as preferable proofs, to private prejudice: As a *Whig*, he was *Whig-issimus*; not an Old Whig, but a new Whig, who exerted great activity in promoting "the good Old Cause (*s*)."
 If, from *the Whig*, we throw a retrospective glance upon the Letters of the *Freeholder* to the *Electors* of *Antrim*, in 1776, we shall perceive, that he then maintained revolutionary doctrines, in order to influence an election (*t*). If, from these letters, we take another re-
 trospect

(*r*) Anti-Jacobin Review, July, 348.

(*s*) See *the Whig* in Almon's Anecdotes, v. iii. p. 1. I yield willing obedience to the juridical rule, which requires, that he who offers a document in evidence, ought to verify it, and connect it with the cause in issue. Mr. Almon is the principal witness, on this litigated question: and, he says, that in 1779, and 1780, he published a Newspaper, called the *London Courant*; that he was perfectly acquainted with the chief writers in it, and with Hugh Boyd, particularly; and that he does know, that Hugh Boyd was the undoubted writer of the essays in it, which were entitled *The Whig*; and which were published, in that newspaper, during the months of November, and December, 1779, and of January, and March 1780.

(*t*) Hugh Boyd was discovered to be the author of the *Freeholder's Letters*, "by finding a scrap of the manuscript copy, which the printer had neglected to destroy." [The Life of Boyd, p. 18.] Having written to an intelligent friend, at Belfast, for a copy of *The Freeholder's Letters*, he wrote me, in answer, on the 19th of October 1799: "I will make a point of searching the booksellers shops for the pamphlet, you write for: The Letters
 " are

trospoct of ten years, we shall easily discover the political principles, which M'Aulay brought with him from the noisy scene of Dr. Lucas, at Dublin, to the more ample theatre of Wilkes and Liberty, at London.

Hugh M'Aulay was naturally recommended to the care of Mr. James Adair, an Irish factor, in the city, the father of the late Serjeant, and his own relation, in whose house, he, for a while, became domesticated. The genteel address, and insinuating manners, of M'Aulay, easily introduced him into fashionable life, and literary society. He became intimate with Mr. Richard Burke, whose principles, and habits, are said to have been similar to his own. He gained ready admission into the families of Mr. Edmund Burke, and of Sir Joshua Reynolds. He obtained the familiarity of Garrick. He became acquainted with many of the members of the *Literary Club* (u). And, becoming a *Man of the Town*, he, incidentally, *became all things to all men*. It is seldom, that any youth gains so many friends, as M'Aulay, and by his friends is ever so much beloved; as it appears, that he was. From those intimations, we may perceive the sources of much of his information, as a political writer, if we consider, that he had great readiness of apprehension, and still greater strength of memory; that he possessed, in a high degree,

“are within the recollection of several of my acquaintance, who tell me, they were written by a M'Aulay-Boyd, who went to India with Lord Macartney.” It is a fact, then, which is notorious amongst the well informed men of Belfast, that M'Aulay Boyd wrote *The Freeholder's Letters*.

(u) See his Life prefixed to the *Indian Observer*, p. 5, 6.

the important faculty of knowing, when to speak, and when to be silent; how to gain, and how to keep a secret: This, then, is the character to impose on mankind!

But, whatever a man's friendships, and occupations, may be, the principal epoch of his life is his marriage. From Hugh M'Aulay's connections, in the city, he probably became acquainted with Miss Frances Morphy, a girl of elegance, and of some fortune, who lived with her mother, at lodgings, in Muscovy Court, Tower-hill: And, her he married, on the 29th of December, 1767, when he was yet under two-and-twenty; and she was still younger (*). The mother, and the daughter, possessed between them, about

(*) "Hugh Macaulay, Esq; of the parish of St. Paul Covent Garden Batch' and Frances Morphy of this parish spinster, were married, in this church, by licence, this twenty-ninth day of December, in the year one thousand seven hundred and sixty-seven, By me George Baxter, A. M.

"This marriage was solemnized between us { Hugh M'Aulay,
Frances Morphy.

"In the presence of { Will: Thornton,
H: Maclean."

"N. B. The above is a copy of the marriage register of the parish of Allhallows Barking, taken this tenth day of December, one thousand seven hundred and ninety-nine by me, James Roe, curate."—The Reverend George Baxter is still alive; and not only recollects this marriage, but that he partook of the wedding-dinner, in the New Road, Chelsea. He remembers, that M'Aulay appeared to him, at that time, as a very intelligent, lively, and conversable, young man; that he afterwards dined with him, in Great Marlborough-street: And, he thinks he heard, that M'Aulay changed his name to Boyd, about a twelvemonth after his marriage. Mrs. Morphy is still remembered, in Muscovy-court.

seven thousand pounds, sterling, which consisted of negroes, and other property, in Jamaica. We have here record-evidence to prove again, that he still passed by his father's name, in 1767, at the era of his marriage. His mother's father is said to have died, in 1765: But, we are assured, that "the bequest of his maternal grandfather did not fall to him till sometime after his marriage; and that when he got the estate, it was so much encumbered with annuities, and harassed by consequent litigations as to afford him hardly any relief (y)." As his own father did not die opulent, we may easily suppose, that the son was deprived, in 1766, at once, of the benefit of a parent's advice, and of the resource of a father's purse.

Hugh M'Aulay-Boyd, was now to maintain a wife, and family, as well as he could, by whatever means. "Towards the latter end of the year 1768, we are told, Mr. Boyd, who, at that period resided in Great Marlborough-street (z), began to be ex-

(y) Pref. to the *Indian Observer*, xvi.—It was, in consequence of the will of his maternal grandfather, that he changed his name to Boyd. Upon inquiry at the Secretary of State's office, and at the College of Arms, I learned, that Hugh M'Aulay never obtained the King's license, for changing his name, I merely state the fact. In England, persons of greater consequence sometimes neglect this useful form. In Ireland, it is never attended to.

(z) I will admit, that he *resided*, at the time mentioned, in Great Marlborough-street, in St. James's parish: But, it is proper, that I should state, that having searched the books of St. James's parish, I could not find, our politician was a *house-keeper*, either by the name of M'Aulay, or Boyd, in this parish, from 1767, to 1774; as he does not appear to have been assessed to parochial taxes.

" tremely

“ tremely sedulous in collecting political information
“ of every kind ; and being in habits of confidential
“ intimacy with the late Mr. Laughlin Maclene, as
“ well as some other political characters, he was ena-
“ bled to obtain very early and accurate intelligence
“ of all ministerial proceedings (a).” Yet ; he who
had read newspapers, at Dublin, from 1761 to 1765,
with the intellect, and memory of M'Aulay ; he who
had read political papers, at London, from 1766 to
1768, and attended both houses of parliament, with
his readiness of apprehension, and tenacity of recollec-
tion ; he, who had lived, in the familiar habits of
relationship, with the late Serjeant Adair, from 1765
to 1769 ; had not to *begin* the study of politics,
in 1768. M'Aulay, certainly, published, during that
period, some essays, under the signature of DEMO-
CRITUS, which were a sort of intellectual exercises,
that were much in practice, at that feverish period,
among the best educated of the Irish Templars, who
thronged the bar of the House of Lords, and the gal-
lery of the House of Commons, more than Westmin-
ster Hall (b). It is, therefore, in vain, to talk, in the
face of facts, of the commencement of M'Aulay's po-
litical studies, in 1768. A strong cause is never so
effectually betrayed, as by the offer of weak arguments
to support it. If I might assume, for a moment, that
M'Aulay-Boyd was the writer of Junius's Letters, I

(a) The Editor's letter of the 4th of August last. [Morn.
Chron.]

(b) From the information of my well informed correspondent
of the Irish bar, at Dublin.

could

could easily show how he was employed in 1769 (*c*), in 1770 (*d*), and in 1771 (*e*). Junius ceased to write, under that signature, in January 1772; because, he was unable, from the distressed circumstances of the writer, to live any longer, in London. The place of his retirement was Raston-Green, near Harrow. In this retirement, he found leisure to regret the past, and to provide for the future. From that place, he used frequently to walk to town, and to return the same day; for the purpose, no doubt, of providing for his family (*f*), and of collecting intelligence.

Distress

(*c*) The first letter of Junius was dated on the 29th of January 1769; which was followed, in the same year, by thirty letters, under the signatures of Junius, and Philo-Junius, "besides the numberless trifles, which he had written, without being able to recall them to his memory." [Gen. ed. vol. 2. p. 230.]

(*d*) He wrote only six letters, in 1770, if we may judge from what he re-published in his genuine edition; having ceased to print, under those signatures, during the prosecutions against his printers, and booksellers.

(*e*) In 1771, he published five and twenty letters: and three or four papers, in 1772; under his usual signatures.

(*f*) A writer in the *True Briton* of the 24th October, 1799, under the signature of VERAX, has sketched, with so nice a pencil, an account of *Hugh Boyd*, about the year 1774, that I will lay it before the reader, as I have nothing so characteristic to exhibit:

"*Hugh Boyd* was the second son of a Mr. Macaulay, whose father was one of Dean Swift's executors. He changed his name for an estate of about £. 300 per annum: he was a tall, well proportioned man, and rather athletic; his complexion was fair, he wore his own hair, twisted behind: his countenance was fixed, grave, and very strongly marked; his nose was prominent, his mouth wide, his cheeks lank, and his eyes very large, info-

" much

Distress is seldom stationary : and M'Aulay-Boyd returned, with his family, to London, probably in

1775.

" much that he could command them more sideways than any
" other person I ever saw : as he could see sideways more than another, so did he turn his neck about to see less than any other, so
" that he often had the appearance of having a stiff neck : he was,
" from the rotundity of the orb of the eye, near sighted, for
" which reason, as he walked the streets he generally used a glass,
" which hung from his neck : he was thin about the shoulders, although they were broad, and his shoulders were rather high :
" his dress was very plain ; he wore always a cocked hat ; his
" walk was quick, and his mood was pensive. Nobody of observation could have passed him without wishing to know who
" he was.

" It was about the year 1774, that I first knew Mr. Boyd, when
" he was about twenty-seven years old, but he looked older : his
" residence then was at Ruston Green, near Harrow, from thence
" he frequently walked to London and back again the same day.
" Whenever he slept in town, he generally took up his abode with
" one friend or another, for no man had more real friends. He
" was then married to a Miss Morphy, a lady from Jamaica,
" who had an annuity, and whose mother was still living. I was
" told at that time that Mr. Boyd had gamed and injured his fortune, and that he once played a match at tennis, with a [negro]
" boy tied to his back :—but when I knew him he had relinquished tennis ; for though I frequented the court, I never saw him
" play but once ; indeed his fight was against him. Mr. Boyd
" was a good player of chess, and made a stand against Count
" Brühl.

" Having dissipated his fortune, and the annuity of Mrs. Boyd
" not being enough for his mode of living, Mr. Boyd contracted
" the habit of raising the means, which flung him out of every
" steady pursuit of life, gave him a countenance of care, and
" made him look as if he was forming great plans—when the
" fact was, that he was only thinking how to live. This situation
" certainly harassed him very much ; and at length it became
" his practice to resort to the mode of supply alluded to. All
" other attentions, instead of an improvement of the understanding,

1775. At this epoch of his life, he engaged in a very arduous task, when he undertook to persuade the world, that Robert, and Daniel, Perreau were innocent of the felonious charge of forging the Bond of William Adair, with design to defraud Robert, and Henry, Drummond (*p*). The forgery was detected, in March 1775: bills of indictment were found against them, on the 25th of April. They were tried, not long after; when Robert Perreau read a defence, of uncommon art, and ability, elegance, and pathos, which very much affected those, who were, nevertheless, constrained, by the evidence, to find him guilty. Daniel Perreau was also found guilty. Notwithstanding every endeavour to save them, they were both executed, on the 17th of January 1776 (*q*).

What

“ing, served rather to dissipate, than to amuse a mind depressed
 “with the burthensome care of ways and means. For if Mr.
 “Boyd had been free from such necessities, he certainly had an
 “understanding and an education equal to most of his time, and
 “to any undertakings.”

“His memory was wonderful—He wrote the speech of Lord
 “Chatham, after he came from the House of Lords, before he
 “slept. *I saw him whilst he was about it.* The great excellence
 “of that speech consists in the exactness of it. It was not merely
 “what Lord Chatham meant, but what he actually said. No-
 “body who read it, can hesitate to say but it must be what Lord
 “Chatham said.”

(*p*) I remember, very well, says Mr. C—B—, “the infinite
 “pains he took to persuade the world that the Perreaus were
 “innocent.” [Anti-Jacobin Rev. for July, p. 349.]

(*q*) Gent. Mag. 1775, p. 148, 205. 279, 289. Coupling
 the fact, that Boyd took infinite pains to persuade the world of the
 Perreaus

What Boyd's connections were, with those noted swindlers, I am unable to tell. He appeared, immediately, after their fate was decided, in the North of Ireland. Whatever motive carried him thither, his attention was at once drawn to it, by the sound of an election, for the county of Antrim, in pursuance of the parliamentary limitation, for which his father had written. Assuming the familiar appellation of a *Freeholder*, he addressed a dozen letters to the independent electors of Antrim; in order to gain their votes, for "a CONSTITUTIONAL CANDIDATE." It was one James Wilson, an obscure adventurer, who was thus supported by M'Aulay Boyd, against all the Aristocratic, and leading, interests of that considerable shire (*r*). "These letters,"

Perreau's innocence, with the uncommon force of Robert Perreau's defence, I am led to entertain a strong suspicion, that this elaborate argument was written by the eloquent pen of Boyd. Take the two first paragraphs, as an example: "My Lords, and Gentlemen of the Jury; If I had been wanting in that fortitude, which is the result of innocence, or had found any hesitation in submitting my proceedings to the strictest scrutiny, I need not, at this day, have stood before my country, or set my life upon the issue of a legal trial. Supported by the consciousness of my integrity, I have forced that transaction to light, which might else have been suppressed; and I have voluntarily sought that imprisonment, which guilt never invites, and even innocence has been known to fly from; ardently looking forward to this hour, as the sure, though painful means, of vindicating a character, not distinguished indeed for its importance, but hitherto maintained, without a blemish." [See the whole of this very able defence in the *Gent. Mag.* 1775. p. 280—83.]

(*r*) The other candidates were, the Honourable Henry Seymour Conway, the Honourable Hugh Skeffington, and John O'Neil.

“ters,” says my intelligent correspondent at Dublin, “are known to have contributed to the raising of that wild clamour, which carried Wilson’s election by an enthusiastic blast of momentary madness.” Yet, whatever engagements were required by the patriotic electors, or promises were made by the *constitutional candidate*, they were soon exposed by parliamentary experience: In two, or three, sessions, Wilson’s *patriotism* was softened into compliance, by a place, in the revenue, of two or three hundred pounds a year; which, for aught that appears, he enjoys to this day. There are so many examples of patriotic tergiversation, that this example was not wanted, to teach moderation to the vehement, at popular elections, and circumspection to the credulous.

The mind of our *Freeholder* of *Antrim* is strongly impregnated with the very essence of *Junius*: He has his flowery style, his dexterous sophistry, and his anarchical violence. The principle, and indeed, the pen, of the mysterious *Junius* are discernible, by an attentive eye, in the preface, and, I was going to say, in every paragraph, of our *Freeholder* (s).

The

The last, who represented, as his name implies, the ancient kings of the *Ulsterian Regions*, declined the contest: This is the same Lord O’Neil, who was, lately, slain by the *Antrim* rebels.

(s) *Junius* begins his dedication to the *English nation*, by saying, “I dedicate to you a collection of letters written by *one of yourselves*.” The *Freeholder* says, in his *first* letter, “It is indispensably ours; for, “the fee simple is in us.” Permit, therefore, *one of yourselves*, to submit his thoughts.” Not only are the expressions transferred from *Junius* to the *Freeholder*, but the topics

The first letter of the Freeholder is dated on the 5th of February; and the last, on the 9th of April, 1776. His first *motto* is the well known Jacobinical principle of *Junius*: "They are the trustees, not the

topicks of both are exactly the same: In both, the writer is studious to insult Scotland, and the Scots: In both, he speaks contemptuously of the *pedant*, James: In both, he talks indignantly of the *Scottish historian* [Hume.] He delights, in both, to ridicule the *blushing* Rigby. In *Junius*, he reviles Mr. Horne, as a solitary monk: In the *Freeholder*, he reviles Dean Tucker, as the *priest* of Gloster: Now, he had his education among monks and priests. *Junius* insisted on the constitutional right to the *pressing* of seamen. [Lett. ix.] The *Freeholder* equally repeats the same doctrine "of the King's right to press a particular description of his subjects into the sea service." [Pref. xii.] *Junius* recommends to the English nation the example of the city of London [Lett. xxxvii.]: The *Freeholder* recommends to the electors of Antrim the example of the city of London, [Lett. xi.] In *Junius*, he says, "the people of Ireland have been, uniformly, plundered and oppressed." In the *Freeholder*, he insists, "The spirit of despotism is gone forth; oppression her object, devastation her means, famine, sword, and fire, her instruments." [Pref. x.] *Junius* is the patron of the colonies: In the *Freeholder*, the same writer is their *apologist*. [Pref. xi.] The author transplants his own *flowers*, delicate as they are, from his *Junius* to his *Freeholder*: *Junius* begins his Lett. lxxix, by saying, "I turn with pleasure from that barren waste, in which no salutary plant takes root, no *verdure* quickens, to a character fertile, &c.: The *Freeholder* concludes his 5th letter, by saying, "Long enough have our eyes ached over this barren prospect, where no *verdure* of virtue quickens, no public service is seen to blossom." *Junius* had the policy to be the *depository* of his own secret, which he resolved should *perish* with him: The *Freeholder* had the policy to preserve his own secret; saying "My name is unknown, and I hope it will remain so." [Lett. 1st.] Such are the coincidences, between *Junius* and the *Antrim Freeholder*, which will convince all those, who read for information, that the same energetic, and elegant, pen wrote both.

"owners of the estate. The fee-simple is in us." Theobald Wolfe Tone could not have gone beyond this! The *Freeholder* sets out, in the following manner: "The great writer, whose words I have placed
 "at the head of my paper, is justly acknowledged
 "to excel, in splendour of imagery, and in strength
 "of diction. But his excellence extends to points still
 "more important. No writer has investigated with
 "such sagacity, nor with such clearness pointed out,
 "the true nature of our admirable constitution. The
 "wisdom, and learning of Locke had ascertained some
 "great fundamental maxims, which constituted or at
 "least contributed to form the basis of our liberties.
 "But, it remained for the succeeding address, and
 "eloquence of *Junius*, to encounter and to subdue, at
 "least, in the fields of argument, the more refined
 "corruptions of latter times." Here, then, is the
 father fondling his child, in a place, where he supposed
 himself to be unknown, and at a time, when the fili-
 ation could not easily be suspected: The *Antrim*
Freeholder was, actually, called, throughout the ample
 circulation of the Belfast newspapers, a *second Junius*.
 To this honourable distinction, our *Freeholder* was
 well entitled. Of the *splendour of imagery, and strength*
of diction, which are so emphatically claimed by the
 son, for the father, there is nothing more striking, nor
 more appropriate, in the *real Junius*, than the sub-
 joined paragraph, from the *first Freeholder*: "We are
 "no longer sunk in the dead repose of despotism,
 "and long parliaments. Those stagnations of corrup-
 "tion and filth, shall no more poison the land. "*Alba*
 "nautis stella refulsit." "The returning day-star of
 "the

“ the constitution again illuminates the political hemisphere; and, in fulness of splendour, displays the glorious moment, which restores to us our original rights. The power, which we delegated, and the trust, which we conferred, revert to us. The constitution regenerates. And the new birth inspires new vigour. As the giant received renovation of strength from touching his mother earth, so the rights of the people acquire new spring and force, when brought back to their original and parent-source, the people’s voice.”—The *Freeholder’s* Letters, which are thus remarkable, for their artifice, their elegance, and their energy, were soon republished at Belfast, by Wilson’s committee, in a small pamphlet, which I have seen, without the names, either of the bookseller, or the printer (1).

From Belfast, our patriotic *Freeholder* went to Dublin, where he was called to the bar, in Easter-term 1776, by the name of Hugh Boyd (2). We may hereby see how facts confirm each other: The fact, that Hugh M’Aulay-Boyd wrote the *Freeholder* at Belfast, in February, and March, 1776, goes to prove, that the same Hugh M’Aulay-Boyd was called to the bar at Dublin, in Easter term 1776: And, the fact, that Hugh Boyd was then, and there, called to the bar, strongly corroborates, by its coincidence, that

(1) I have now, in my possession, a copy of it, which was printed in 1776, by M. Mills, No. 135, Capel-street, Dublin.

(2) Wilson’s Dublin Directory, p. 117: This fact is certain; as I have been assured by two very eminent members of the Irish bar.

Hugh M'Aulay Boyd wrote the *Antrim Freeholder*. His embarrassments forced him to put on the gown, while his dissipation induced him to cast it off, as an incumbrance to his pursuits: And, he soon returned to London, which had attractions for him, that were too powerful for his interest, and too seductive for his happiness. We have, in M'Aulay Boyd, the example of a man, who, with every material quality in him of a great lawyer, facility of apprehension, strength of intellect, retentiveness of memory, confidence of address, could only busy himself, in writing anarchical essays, although he was goaded by distress, and assailed by the cries of a family.

We may, naturally, suppose, that, from Dublin, he returned to his old haunts, and habits, in London. How he was, particularly, employed, during the years 1777, and 1778, I am unable to tell: But, it is certain, that he once more began to write seditious papers, which commenced in November 1779, and ended in March 1780 (x). The *London Courant* was the vehicle of those papers, which were entitled *The Whig*. He, who reads *The Whig*, with attention, will easily perceive the pencil of *Junius*, and acknowledge the pen of *the Freeholder*: He will see in it, the same principles of anarchy, the same topics of turbulence, the same dexterities of sophistry, and the same characteristics of style; its inaccuracies, its figures, its declamation, and its vigour (y). Yet, *the Whig* did not

(x) Almon's Appendix to his *Pol. Anecdotes*, p. 1—36.

(y) Take as an example, from the same book, p. 24, the following passage, at a venture: "The Septennial act of suicide, abhor-
" rent

not *elevate*, and *surprize*, like *Junius*. There was no Sir William Draper, says Almon, to write *the Whig* into notice. The truth, however, is, that *Junius* was at once *political*, and *personal*; *the Whig* was chiefly *political*. The nation, which had been stunned with such noise, now began to be tired of turbulence, and to loath licentiousness.

At length, a new prospect opened on M'Aulay Boyd, who now turned his eyes, and his efforts, from the seditiousness of the West, to the opulence of the East. By the influence of "Mr. Laurence Sullivan, "who so often filled the chair at the India-house,"

"rent certainly from the popular nature of parliament, and destructive of its due independence, on the crown, had been long persecuted. Military power and civil influence united to enable the prince, if he were so disposed by nature or education, to oppress and corrupt the people, whose property and power was [were] lessened, exactly in the proportion that the crown had gained weight and force, by the establishment of a standing army and a national debt. But, above all, the time of his ascension to the throne was full of such peculiar circumstances of popularity, as gave him unlimited, because unsuspected, power. Into that auspicious moment was crowded all the promise of his youth; founded in the fond memory of all the virtues of his ancestors; of his youth, rising, as it seemed, to renew the race of glory that they had run, even up to the recent goal of universal conquest. Nature and fortune conspired to give the young monarch of that day an empire the best and most permanent that monarchs can enjoy, if they wish to maintain it, an absolute power in the hearts of his subjects. Such *was* [were] the power and the opportunity of exercising it, with which his present Majesty ascended the throne. If it had been the counsel of his reign to improve it into the perfect and reciprocal happiness of himself and his people, the way was not steep nor difficult."

our *Whig* was allowed to go out to Madras, "in Lord "Macartney's suite (z)," although not as a covenanted servant. Neither he, who asked, nor they, who granted, this permission, were probably conscious how much service they did to the state, when they permitted the emigration of a political writer of active exertions, and powerful energy. Whether he had written *Junius*, the *Antrim Freeholder*, or the *Whig*, having never inquired, they did not know. Amid his preparations for departure, with few fears, and many hopes, our emigrant destroyed all his political papers.

M'Aulay-Boyd arrived at Madras early in 1781. He now "devoted his leisure hours very sedulously to "the study of Oriental politics (a). The time soon arrived, when his talents of insinuation, and address, and his knowledge of *oriental politics*, were brought into action. In January 1782, he arrived with Sir Edward Hughes, on board the *Superbe*, at Trincomalee. The fort was hardly taken, when he was dispatched on an embassy to the King of CANDY. He was not successful, as a negociator. At the end of two months, he returned to Trincomalee, where he unluckily hired a small vessel to carry him to Madras. He was taken by the French, and carried to the Mauritius; from which place he was sent to the Isle of Bourbon. Here, his captivity was alleviated by the hospitality of the governor; and, after a while, he was, by the liberality of the same officer, allowed to return, on his parole, to Madras. He now thought

(z) Life of Boyd, 7—8.

(a) Id.

that

that his services, and misfortunes, entitled him to some office, which might compensate him for both. But, out of nothing nothing comes; and, as there was no vacancy, he could have no place. His disappointment drove him to Calcutta, where, he, no doubt, hoped to court fortune, in a more propitious mood. In this gay scene, his social disposition was welcomed by hospitality, which was, in return, enlivened "by the superlative sprightliness of his convivial qualities (*b*).” In the mean time, he was appointed, jointly, with Mr. Corbit, *master attendant* at Madras; an office of some profit, but of little dignity; and which required his personal presence, where it was to be executed. Thus, was the mighty *Junius*, the *Antrim Freeholder*, the *Independent Whig*, transformed into the harbour-master of Madras (*c*).

The duties of this office "were neither congenial to "the delicacy of his mind, nor his habits of life," says his biographer; "but, as the emoluments were great, "he resolved to sacrifice a little sensibility, for the "prospect of ultimate wealth." His old habits, in the mean time, induced him to return to his early practices: And, during the Mysore war, he conducted a newspaper, entitled *The Courier* (*d*).

It

(*b*) Life of Boyd, p. 15.

(*c*) Id.—Such, I was told, at the India-house, is the nature of the *master attendant's* office, which, since that period, has been rented at four thousand pounds a year: In the end, he enjoyed this office, without the participation of Mr. Corbit; but, without making any remittances.

(*d*) Ib. p. 16.—I will here subjoin a note, which I have received from an intelligent friend, with regard to the management of

It was, in June 1793, that he first conceived the idea of publishing *periodical essays*: It was in August 1793, that he first made known to the public his plan for the *Indian Observer*, which he resolved to publish, through the commodious channel of a weekly news-paper: And, the first number of this paper, which he entitled *The Hircarrah*, came out on the 9th of September 1793. For these essays, he appears to have been "honoured with the sanction of the higher powers, and favoured with the indulgence of the [Indian] public." What Johnson said of *the Connoisseur*, and *the World*, that *they wanted matter*, may be properly applied to *the Indian Observer*: But, the *Indian Observer* is superior to both, in vigour, and elegance (e). The power, and pride, of *Junius* were his figures. The *Indian Observer* too has his imagery.

After

of M'Aulay-Boyd, as the conductor of *the Courier*: "It is notorious that the late Hugh Boyd was proprietor, editor, and sole conductor of the *Madras Courier*; that his paper was engaged in many important contests, both for, and against, the government of Madras, and Bengal: If Hugh Boyd was the author of *Junius*, his language may be easily discovered in the *Madras Courier*; where, at various times, he was placed in a situation, which called for the utmost exertion of all his abilities: For, *he always liked to fish in troubled waters*."

(e) The motto of the *Indian Observer's* first number is from the *Rambler*, on the difficulty of the first address. "If such be the acknowledgement of a great master, who to extraordinary force of mind, united the ample stores of learning and knowledge, and with a strength of style peculiarly his own, presented more subjects to the public eye than perhaps any other author; what must be the feelings of the common class of writers?—and, if merely, the first address involve so much difficulty, how formidable must be

"the

After noticing how the *Spectator* “looked vice into
 “shame; how “the *Tatler* told every thing to every
 “body, and told it so well, that the hearer was al-
 “lured to listen, and delighted to laugh;” how
 “the *Guardian* watched with anxious attention
 “against mischief;” he showed how “the *WORLD*
 “displayed its knowledge, and diffused the precept
 “of its best science, in a manner so agreeably varied,
 “as to prove, that the conductors of that literary pla-
 “net, for its day of influence, were well qualified to
 “discriminate the parallaxes of pleasure and propriety,
 “in the school of fashion; to catch and correct the
 “fluctuating manners in that changeable scene; to
 “prove, by a happy mixture of the most pleasing with
 “the most useful doctrine, that the true orbit of the

“the undertaking, to repeat, at stated periods, certain *quantums* of
 “composition; to bind fancy down to punctuality; and to present
 “to the public attention, a periodical essay? How arduous ought
 “the attempt to appear, if they knew themselves, to those whose
 “literary ambition must be conscious of much unstudious avocation;
 “who have omitted to supply by observation, or even late enquiry,
 “what perhaps was early neglected in study, or denied in genius;
 “to those, in fine, whose experience is so limited, both of them-
 “selves and the public, that they think they can write, and hope
 “they will be read. It may be remarked, that these difficulties are
 “more felt by the veteran than the young adventurer; that for-
 “ward zeal will rush, where caution would tremble to tread; and
 “that the superficial judge boldly plunges into his sea of trou-
 “bles; fearless, because ignorant, of the dangers of the literary
 “deep. Although not wholly in the latter description, of absolute
 “inexperience, the present writer is well aware of his distance
 “from the former. He regards, with a most respectful eye, the in-
 “terval between his humble essay, and the excellence of periodical
 “publication, which, for an Augustan century, has been the orna-
 “ment and instruction of his country.”

“man

“man of pleasure is within the excentricities of extravagance; and the sphere of honour has ever virtue for its center.” This imagery was favourably received, and usefully felt at Madras: Before the publication of the second *Observer*, a hundred subscribers were added to the list of encouragers. *The Indian Observer* went the length of fifty-three numbers; and was closed, on the 16th of September 1794. It was, indeed, time to finish it: For, in the fiftieth number of the 19th August 1794, appeared the cloven foot of M'Aulay, *Junius*, and the *Whig*; the blunder of the one; the inaccuracy of the other; and the seditiousness of all: “An observer of the great events of the world,” says the *Indian Observer*, “must be more struck with the extraordinary contest, which agitates not only the nations of Europe, but extends its commotion to the other quarters of the globe, than with any scene presented in the annals of history; whether it be considered, as to its consequences, or in its principles. In the consequences, are [is] involved the happiness of mankind; the sacred principles, by which it is actuated, are liberty, and the rights of man.” The *Indian Observer* had properly engaged, that “this paper should not mix in political questions:” Yet, M'Aulay, with his usual spirit, introduced, on the scene, the *rights of man*; his ungrammatical substitution of *are* for *is* may be considered as characteristic of his *Junius*; and his exhibition of the French revolution, with its “sacred principles,” to the servants of the India company, was altogether worthy of his *Whig*.

The foregoing sentiments of the *Indian Observer* were

introductory to "The *speech* of GALGACUS, to his army on the *Grampian hills*, from Murphy's *Translation* of Tacitus. That either M'Aulay, or Murphy, should have considered the declamation of Tacitus, as the speech of *Galgac*, the Caledonian chief, is a proof how much the most vigorous minds may be warped by prejudice. Yes: The speech of Galgac had been printed by *Raban*, who had introduced printing at Aberdeen, a town, which lay in the rear of the Caledonian army; and the speech, thus printed, in the Caledonian language, was dispersed among the Caledonian tribes, in the true French mode, to inflame them with a love of French liberty, and to encourage them to defend *the rights of man*, which were vastly well understood, in that age. Whether that celebrated oration were delivered, in the *British*, or in the *Erse*, language, we are not told: But, it must have been transmitted, in whatever language, by Agricola, and translated, no doubt, by Tacitus. The re-translation of Tacitus's *libertates* into Pain's *rights of man*, was deemed very free by Murphy; and the recommendation of French politics, and French principles, in the most engaging manner, to the servants of the India company, as *British sentiments*, in *British expression*, was perfectly congenial to Junius.

This extraordinary man finished his devious career, on the 19th of October 1794, at Madras, in the most embarrassed circumstances, after having been abandoned by some of his friends (*f*). The character of M'Aulay Boyd must be settled from a consideration of the great outlines of his *life*, and from the strong

(*f*) Life of Boyd, pa. 15.

evidence of his undoubted publications, rather than from the frivolous declamation of biographical fondness (*g*). He left behind him a widow, a woman of accomplishments, who delights in books; and two children,

(*g*) I will, however, subjoin the following outline of the character of M^r Aulay-Boyd, which has been transmitted to me, by a very eminent Member of the Irish bar, who no longer resides at Dublin; and who appears to have known this extraordinary person, from his cradle to his grave; although my intelligent correspondent seems to give a somewhat different point to the subject from mine:—"I knew Mr. Boyd from his early life; but the difference in our ages rendered, for several years, our intimacy not so perfect, as it afterwards became.—I had quitted school, the university, and the Temple, successively, before him; so that, from my own knowledge, I cannot say any thing of his studies, or attainments; but I have always understood, that he distinguished himself over most of his contemporaries: He was a very good Greek, and Latin, scholar, and was well acquainted with different branches of the mathematics. He did not, as I believe, study our laws, with a view to the profession: He was, it is true, called to the *Irish* bar, but did not continue to practise there: He was never at the *English* bar. He was fond of what is called polite literature, and excelled in it. He was not much attached to other studies. Excepting a periodical paper, which he published at Madras, under the title of *The Indian Observer*, and some light poetical essays, of which I have no copies, I was not acquainted with any of his productions, in prose, or verse; and I am much inclined to believe, he did not engage in any serious work, in either: I was in the habits of intimate correspondence with him, for many years, before his death, and I never had any reason to think he did. He had very pleasing manners; and though he often took the lead in conversation, it was generally with the consent of the company: He was fond of argument, but never overbearing: He excelled in lively sallies, but scarce ever introduced serious subjects, moral, or political: His talents, and attainments, did not seem to lead him to either. He first came to Madras, as assistant secretary: Sir George Staunton was secretary to Lord Macartney. Soon after his arrival, there, he was sent

" to

children, a boy, and a girl: The son, who was born after his father's departure to the east, possesses his genius, with greater application; and, with his forwardness, has already produced a tragedy.

I now proceed to prove, affirmatively, who did write Junius's letters. Some readers may, perhaps, be already satisfied, from the foregoing intimations, that my original opinion was right. There are persons, however, who will not easily be persuaded to adopt a truth, which can only be established by circumstantial proofs; without considering the judgements of those able men, who regard the evidence of circumstances, as the strongest; because human testimony is so extremely fallible.

It

"to Ceylon, on some negotiation, with the king of Candy; the particulars of this have never been published: His papers, it is said, were lost, when, on his attempting to return to Madras, he was taken by a French frigate, and carried to Mauritius: He did, however, return to Madras, before Lord Macartney quitted that government; and was by him appointed to a very lucrative employment, *joint master attendant* with a Mr. Corbitt: He afterwards became sole master attendant, and enjoyed the office until his death. His being at Calcutta was only to pay occasional visits to his friend Sir John Macpherson. On the particular subject, which, from our friend's letter, I learn you mean to investigate, I can give no particular information: That Mr. Boyd was not the author of Junius, I will not presume to assert, but from comparing the time those celebrated letters were written with the time he came to England, it will appear very extraordinary, that he could have obtained so much, and so various, knowledge of the political drama, there exhibited, and of the *dramatis personæ*, as are there displayed."—I am, moreover, informed, obligingly, by the Rev. Dr. George Hall, of Trinity College, Dublin, "that Mr. M^cAulay-Boyd commenced Bachelor of Arts, in this University, on the 19th of February 1765; and never was admitted to any other degree."

It was in January 1769, that "Junius burst into notice with a blaze of impudence," says Johnson, "which has rarely glared upon the world before." Junius, though he had provided for his safety, by impenetrable secrecy, was immediately encountered by Sir William Draper, who did not wield unequal arms: But, his infelicity, and his comparative feebleness, consisted, in his being a known character; whilst Junius strengthened himself with the immunities of invisibility. Sir William returned often to the charge; although repulsed by Junius. Sir William was not overpowered by the artillery of learning, wit, and argument, in which he was quite equal to his antagonist; but, he was foiled by recrimination, which was a common, and a forcible, weapon, in the hands of Junius. Sir William, as a scholar, had been bred at Eton, and King's college, Cambridge; but, he chose the sword, for his profession. In India, he ranked with those famous warriors, Clive, and Laurence. In 1761, he acted at Bellisle, as a Brigadier. In 1763, he commanded the troops, who conquered Manilla, which place was saved from plunder, by the promise of a ransom, that was never paid. His first appearance, as an able writer, was in his clear refutation of the objections of the Spanish court (*b*). His services were rewarded with the command of the sixteenth regiment of foot, which he resigned to Colonel Gisborne, for his half-pay of £.1200 Irish: This common transaction furnished Junius with many a sarcasm. Sir William had scarcely closed his contest with that formidable

(*b*) Gent. Mag. Vol. XXXIV. p. 590.

opponent,

opponent, when he had the misfortune to lose his wife; who died, on the 1st of September 1769. As he was foiled, he was, no doubt, mortified. And he set out, in October of that year, to make the tour of the Northern Colonies, which had now become objects of notice, and scenes of travel. He arrived at Charles-town, South Carolina, in January 1770; and, travelling northward, he arrived, during the summer of that year, in Maryland; where he was received with that hospitality, which she always paid to strangers, and with the attentions, that were due to the merit of such a visiter. It was at Mount-Clare, the villa of Charles Carrol, near Baltimore-town, where Sir William was kindly entertained, in company with the Governor, and other persons of distinction: And, in this company, was held a conversation, which, as it, pointedly, bears upon the present subject, merits minute attention (*i*).—From Maryland,

(*i*) This conversation has been stated to me, in a letter from an ingenious friend, who was present; and for whose precision, and probity, I will be answerable: His letter is as follows:

“ Dear Sir,

“ I remember Sir William Draper, when he visited America, “ in the summer 1770. He passed through Baltimore: Dining in “ company with him at a gentleman’s house, where many were “ present; the conversation after dinner turned upon the subject of “ Junius’s letters, to which I gave attention; as Sir William Draper “ was present. On a gentleman’s asking Sir William Draper, “ whether Mr. Burke was not suspected of being the author, Sir “ William replied, that he did, at first, suspect Mr. Burke, from “ his attachment to that party, whose principles were supported by “ Junius; Sir William said, before he left England, he acquitted “ Mr. Burke; for, on speaking to him, Mr. Burke assured him he “ was not the author.”

G

“ Sir

Maryland, Sir William passed on to New York, where he married Miss De Lancy, a lady of great connections there, and agreeable endowments, who died, in 1778; leaving him a daughter. In 1779, he was appointed Lieutenant-governor of Minorca; a trust, which, however discharged, ended unhappily. He died, at Bath, on the 8th of January 1787 (*k*).

“ Sir William added, that early in the dispute he, and his friends, “ had taken great pains to ascertain the author, and that direct application was made, for that purpose, to the printer, whether by “ Sir William, or a friend I did not understand;—that Mr. Woodfall “ the printer answered, his paper was an open one, and he was, “ and had been, as ready to publish Sir William Draper’s letters, “ as those of Junius;—that if he did know the author, who “ wrote under the signature of Junius, he would not give up his “ name; and further said, that the letters came to him in a such “ manner, that he did not enquire after, or know the writer, at that “ time.—A gentleman observing, that whoever was the author, “ was certainly well acquainted with political characters, and the “ state of parties, at that period; Sir William said, he certainly “ was; and a very formidable antagonist to encounter in a public “ discussion: That he was a man who must move in the highest “ circles, as his information appeared to be drawn from sources, to “ which none but a man of high birth, and character, or one that “ has filled an office of consequence in the government, could have “ had access to.

“ A gentleman saying, that the public were obliged to Junius for “ bringing forward Sir William Draper’s letters, as he, Sir William, “ had lost nothing by the contest; Sir William politely thanked “ him for the compliment, and added, that he wrote for the sake “ of truth, and to vindicate the character of a friend. Before the “ conversation closed, a gentleman said, you, certainly, Sir William, “ in acquitting Mr. Burke, must have suspected some other person;— “ Sir William replied, he had some suspicion of Lord George “ Sackville.”

*****”.

(*k*) An. Reg.—Gent. Mag. 1787. p. 91.

We

We have thus learned, from the conversation of Sir William Draper, on whom the suspicions fell, with regard to the writing of Junius, during the summer of 1770. He acquitted Edmund Burke; and he had, of Lord George Sackville, some suspicion, which we now know to have been unfounded. That the letters of Junius were written by a person, "who moved in the highest circles," we, moreover, know to be very problematical. Boyd moved in circles, whence he derived his whole information; except what he had, copiously, gleaned from the printed pamphlets, which, at that period, greatly abounded. Among a thousand persons, whom he knew, and to whom he was known, Boyd was intimately connected with Lauchlan M^cLean, who had been Under Secretary of State, from 1766, to 1768. The truth, however, is, as I have already intimated, that there is no other *official* information in *Junius*, than could have been collected from the *Red-book*, and the *Army List*, by a person, who knew how to enlarge what was deficient, and to curtail what was superfluous. Had Sir William Draper given his opinion of *Junius*, after his formidable antagonist had been foiled by Mr. Horne, and had debased his pretensions to greatness, by engaging, unsuccessfully, in city politics, and mingling, factiously, with the Supporters of the Bill of Rights, he would no otherwise have regarded *Junius*, than as the *meteor*, which had plunged its followers in a bog.

That the writer of *Junius* was a frequent attendant in both Houses of Parliament is sufficiently apparent from internal evidence (1). But, Boyd is known to

(1) The Preface to the gen. ed. xviii.: *Junius* often quotes parliamentary speeches, as taken by himself. lb. vol. ii. p. 69.

have been a more assiduous attendant upon the debates in Parliament, than upon the causes in Westminster-hall; to have oftener repeated parliamentary speeches, than to have reported juridical cases.

The letters of *Junius* were not written by an *Englishman*; because an English scholar would not have written *elder*, for *eldest*, nor confounded *have* with *hath*, nor have substituted *collegian*, for the fellow of a college. These obvious inaccuracies are mere *Scoto-Iricisms*: And, Boyd was, undoubtedly, an Irishman; of the Ultonian race, who, like some of his countrymen, hated the people, and the country, whence they had derived their recent origin (*m*), at the re-settlement of Ulster.

It

(*m*) An ingenious friend has informed me, that in 1769, he published, in the *Gazetteer*, an essay, signed *MODESTUS*, in order to determine a wager, whether *Junius* were an *Irishman*: It was previously agreed, that if *Junius* should notice this essay, on the charge of his being an Irishman, the wager should be won; if *Junius* should pass by *MODESTUS*, in silence, the wager should be lost; the parties agreeing, that his *crying out* would imply consciousness of his Irish birth; and that his *silence* would show his unconcern about the imputation. On the 19th of October 1769, *Philo-Junius*, that is *Junius*, formally answered *Modestus*, who had acutely said, that neither an Englishman, nor a Scotsman, and none but an Irishman would have made Sir William Draper *repose* on a *bed of torture*. *Philo-Junius* exclaimed; "But, why must *Junius* be an Irishman? *MODESTUS* cannot distinguish between a *sarcastm* and a *contradiction*." [Let 29. gen. ed. vol. i. p. 201.] *Modestus* had an obvious reply, that a *sarcastm*, which involves a *blunder*, may be a *contradiction*, but not a true *sarcastm*, except on the writer of *blundering sarcastms*. In the preface to the genuine, corrected, edition of *Junius's Letters*, p. xxvi. we have the following passage: "I am far from meaning to impeach the articles of the union. If the true spirit of those articles were adhered to, we should not see English peerages given to Scotch ladies, or-[nor] to the *elder* sons."

It must be apparent to every discerning eye, as it was to the casual inspection of Mr. Wilkes, that the epistles of *Junius* were written by an *inexperienced* hand, with a *juvenile* quill: Now, M^r Aulay-Boyd was not three-and-twenty, when *Junius* first appeared. But, is it probable, that such papers could have been writ-

"sons of Scotch Peers, and the number of sixteen doubled and "trebled by a scandalous evasion of the act of union." An English writer would not have used *elder*, for *eldest*; because the English language does not admit of a *comparative* without a correlative: *Elder*, for *eldest*, is a *Scoticism*, and a *Scoto-Iricism*. A Scottish man would not have written such a passage: And, it was, therefore, written by an Irishman. Again: In *Junius's* preface to his edition of 1771, before mentioned, p. xii, there is the following passage: "Unhappily for this country, the diffidence, distrust, and division, "which thus arose between the parties so greatly interested in, and "desirous of, promoting the same common cause, *have* not only pre- "vented their private success, but *bath*, at the same time, occa- "sioned the cause of the public to miscarry." An English writer would not substitute *bath*, for *have*, which, in this passage, is peculiarly blundering; and which is another *Scoticism*, or rather *Scoto-Iricism*. *Junius* says to Mr. Horne, "I will not descend to answer "the little sneering sophistries of a *collegian*:" An English scholar would not have used, thus, the word *collegian*, which, I am assured, by my intelligent correspondent at Dublin, is peculiar to the *university*, there: But, the word *collegian* is equally current in the universities of Scotland. In December 1769, about six weeks after Almon had taxed Boyd with being *Junius*, "Lord Temple asked "me," says Almon, "if I knew the writer of the letters, signed "*Junius*: I told his Lordship, that I did not; but that I had "my suspicions. His Lordship said, he had his suspicions also; "but, that they did not go to Mr. Burke: Yet, he had no doubt "of the writer being an *Irishman*." [Almon's unpublished Letter to Mr. L. D. Campbell, of the 10th of December 1798.] Now; if those facts, and circumstances, be allowed to point, with a demonstrative finger, to the country of *Junius*, the question about his name would be greatly circumscribed.

ten by such a youth? Yes: Tom Chatterton, a still more extraordinary youth, was, at the same time, walking the streets of London, in quest of bread. He died, on the 25th of August 1770, when he had not reached his twentieth year. It was a favourite maxim of this extraordinary boy, "that man is equal to any thing; and that every thing might be atchieved by diligence, and abstinence." This observation would alone show how intuitively he had penetrated into human nature. He has been likened, by critical enthusiasm, as an impostor, to Mahomet; and compared, as a poet, to Milton. It is, however, agreed by the greatest critics, that he was one of the rarest genius's, which this island has ever produced. As a *politician*, Chatterton surpassed M'Aulay: For, Chatterton wrote, at the same moment, both for, and against, the government: (n) M'Aulay could only write against the government. In the investigation of the powers of man, is it, then, improbable to say,

(n) On the 26th of May 1770, Chatterton addressed a Letter to Lord North, signed MODERATOR; which began: "My Lord; it gives me a painful pleasure;" and contained an *encomium* on the Administration, for rejecting the City Remonstrance: On the same day, Chatterton wrote a Letter to the Lord Mayor, Beckford, signed PROBVS; which contained a virulent invective against the Government, for rejecting the Remonstrance; beginning, "When the endeavours of a spirited people to free themselves from insupportable slavery," &c. [Gregory's Life of Chatterton, p. 88.] In Chatterton's CONSILIAD, a satirical poem, may be seen, in his Miscell. p. 92, the following passage:—

"Inflated DISCORD heard, and left her cell,
 "With all the horrors of her native hell:
 "She, on the soaring wings of genius fled,
 "And waved the pen of JUNIUS round her head."

that

that if such a boy, as Chatterton, could write what has been deemed equal to the first productions of the greatest writers, that such a youth as M'Aulay, who, undoubtedly, wrote what few can write, was unequal to the composition of *Junius*? Of Chatterton, it was observed by Bryant, that with all his powers, he could not write *grammatically*: But, did it require the erudition of Bryant to discover, that between natural genius, and artificial learning, wide is the difference? This observation is alone sufficient to illustrate the scholastic character of *Junius*: He had uncommon genius; but, he wanted grammatical knowledge (*o*). Wilkes shrewdly said, that the writer wanted *expe-*

(*o*) Bryant was led to make his philological remark before mentioned, by seeing, in Chatterton, *more better*: I was induced to observe, in my *Supplemental Apology*, that *Junius* could *not* write common English, *with grammatical propriety*, by seeing, every where, in his pages, the grossest blunders. I would engage to point out in the genuine and *corrected* edition of *Junius*, some blunder, in almost every page of him. Take, as examples, the following: "The form *and* magnitude of a quarto imposes," [impose, 1 v. p. 142.] "Is candid to [an] extreme." [Ib. 152.] "Apparent meaning *and* intention as *it* stands," [as *they* stand, Ib. 153.] "Lord [Lords] Gower, Weymouth, and Sandwich." [Ib. 174.] "Precedents enough," [Ib. 174.] *enow*, says Johnson, is the plural of *enough*. "If he judges; If he admits," [every where.] "A [an] useful act." [Ib. 325.] "An *appear-*ance of morals *and* religion *are* [is] useful." [Ib. 305.] "*Neither were*" [was. Ib. 306.] "When the force *and* direction of personal satire *is* [are] no longer felt." [Dedication, ii.] "They *are* the trustees, not the owners of the estate. The fee simple is *in* us. They cannot alienate, they cannot waste" [it.] [Ib. v.] We may see *is*, for *are*, in vol. 2. p. 1. There is *have*, for *has*. [Ib. 11.]

rience : I accidentally said, that the author wanted age.

It appears, moreover, from every page of JUNIUS, that he delighted to *fish in troubled waters* ; watching every accident, and seizing every opportunity ; intermeddling with the court, and the city ; intriguing with Wilkes, and with the Supporters of the Bill of Rights. Now ; M'Aulay was a *fisher in troubled waters* : He was always " bustling about something or " another (p) : " He fished in troubled waters, when he took infinite pains to persuade the world of the innocence of the Perreaus. He fished in troubled waters, when he wrote his *Antrim Letters* : And he fished in troubled waters at Madras.

M'Aulay was a noted writer in magazines, and news-papers, and was a well-known reporter of parliamentary speeches. Junius says himself, " I cannot " recal to my memory the numerous trifles I have " written (q). And, he frequently refers, in his notes, to the speeches he had heard in parliament ; at the same time, repeating passages of what he had carried away (r).

In his vigour, and activity, Junius may be compared to a race-horse, which seems to outstrip the wind, by his energy, and his speed, without any similarity to the dray-horse, which performs innumerable services, by his persevering labour, and his overpower-

(p) His editor says [Life, p. 20.] " he passed through a checkered, and bustling, life."

(q) Gen. Ed. vol. 2. p. 230.

(r) Pref. xviii. vol. 2. p. 69, &c.

ing force. "I was not born," says Junius, "to be a
 "commentator, even upon my own works (*s*). Of
 his letters, he says (*t*), "to me they originally owe no-
 "thing, but a healthy, sanguine constitution." These
 are *traits of character*, which are, minutely, descriptive
 of M'Aulay, who was, from nature, of a *healthy san-*
guine constitution; who had great activity of intellect,
 and readiness of hand; but had neither persevering la-
 bour, nor overpowering execution: He wrote essays,
 and speeches; but, he could not compose, nor trans-
 late, a book of any size (*u*): And, he wanted appli-
 cation, for the practice of the law; or indeed, for any
 serious employment.

In his *Anecdotes of the Author*, Junius speaks, con-
 temptuously, of the *favourite history* of England, which
 was written by "a *Scotch philosopher*, who was a perfect
 "stranger to the idiom of the English tongue (*x*)."
 M'Aulay, in his *Antrim Letters*, speaks, indignantly,

(*s*). Pref. xii.

(*t*). Dedic. i.

(*u*) "In February 1794," says his Editor, "Mr. Boyd adver-
 "tised proposals for publishing by subscription his *Embassy* to
 "Candy [in 1782.] The tardiness of the public damped the ar-
 "dour, with which he had embraced the project; and he delayed
 "taking up his pen, until a sufficient sum was subscribed, to bear
 "the charges of the press." [Life of Boyd, p. 18.] But, in
 September, he resolved to begin, adds his Editor, what ought to
 have been finished a dozen years before. He trusted to his reten-
 tive memory, for the interesting matter, which was to fill two 8vo.
 volumes. This, then, is incontrovertible proof, that M'Aulay-
 Boyd was incapable of writing a book, which required persevering
 effort.

(*x*) The Pref. *Anecdotes of Junius* to the Edit. 1771, p. xvii.

of "*the Scotch historian*, who had violated the manes " of John Hampden, in his pretended History of " England, which should be really called an Apology " for the house of Stuart." In the *Antrim Freeholder*, there are a thousand coincidences, which prove, that the writer of it was also the writer of Junius's letters (y). Such are the resemblances, which form an indissoluble bond of connection between Junius and M'Aulay-Boyd!

I will now proceed to tie the knot tighter. Boyd was in the habit of frequenting the shop of Almon, who detected him, as the writer of Junius, as early as the autumn of 1769. At a meeting of the book-sellers, and printers, H. S. Woodfall read a letter of Junius, which he had just received, because it contained a passage, that related to the business of the meeting. Almon had thereby an opportunity of seeing the hand-writing of the manuscript, without disclosing his thoughts of the discovery. The next time that Boyd called on him in Piccadilly, Almon said to him, " I " have seen a part of one of Junius's Letters, in manuscript, which I believe is your hand-writing." *Boyd instantly changed colour*; and after a short pause, he said, " the similitude of hand-writing is not a conclusive fact (z)," [proof.] Now; Almon does not deliver these intimations, as mere opinions; but, he speaks, like a witness, to facts, which he knows to be true. It is a fact, then, that Almon taxed Boyd with being the writer of Junius's Letters; that *Boyd there-*

(y) See before, p. 66.

(z) Mr. Almon's Letter to Mr. L. D. Campbell, dated the 10th December 1798, which remains in MS. unpublished.

upon changed colour; and that he only turned off the imputation, by the obvious remark, that comparison of hand-writing is not decisive evidence, to prove the writer. Add to this testimony, that Boyd was, by nature, *confident*, and, by habit, *a man of the town*, a sort of character, who is not apt to blush. From the epoch of this detection, it was the practice of Almon, when he was asked, who was the writer of *Junius*, to say, "that he suspected Junius was a broken gentleman, without a guinea in his pocket."

Again: When Almon came to be prosecuted for the republication of Junius's Letter to the King, during the year 1770, he remarked what confirmed, strongly, his previous suspicions: "During the whole time, that this prosecution was going on," says Almon, "Mr. Boyd never once called upon me; which I could not help observing; because before that time, he commonly called twice or thrice a week; and I thought it not less remarkable, that after the prosecution was totally at an end, he resumed his former custom (a)." Here, then, is proof of another fact, which goes far towards *ascertaining Boyd to be Junius*: For, the former blushes of Boyd were an involuntary confession of his guilt: And, the above conduct was a virtual acknowledgement of his own apprehensions, recollecting the past detection, and fearing the present inquiries.

To the foregoing proofs, which have already satis-

(a) *Id.*—The dates of Junius's Letters demonstrate, that the writer of them skulked, during the prosecutions against the publishers of them: Now, this demonstration confirms the shrewd remark of Almon.

fied

fied fair inquirers about a curious truth, I will add another fact, which is equally decisive. "The wife of Boyd often suspected him, from what she saw, and heard, of being the author of *Junius*; but when she mentioned her suspicions to him, he only smiled." He had resolved, it seems, "to be the *sole depository* of his own secret, which he also determined should perish with him (*b*)."
 He knew intuitively, that a secret, entrusted to many, or even to a wife, can seldom be kept. Yet; is it stated, as a fact, that when Mr. Boyd was at home, with his family, he used to shew at all times an uncommon degree of interest about the Letters of *Junius*; and with the confidential relation above-mentioned [his wife] he often fought a *tête-à-tête* conversation upon them, seeming pleased at the remarks, which were made, whether of censure, or praise. With his other friends, he was sometimes indifferent, and frequently close, on the subject of *Junius*. He was a zealous advocate for the political principles, which those letters contain; but was slow in bestowing praise on their literary merits, and occasionally objected to the boldness of some particular passages." Other persons were studious, to disavow the knowledge of those letters. Boyd was forward to shew his interest in them; to seek conversations about them; and to advocate their principles, malignant, and anarchical, as they were (*c*).

Of

(*b*) Dedication, p. ii.

(*c*) I have likewise *impartial* evidence, to prove, that M^r Aulay-Boyd was forward to shew an interest about the letters of *Junius*. — Moreover, my very intelligent correspondent, at Dublin, has also

Of a point, which is, sufficiently, clear, some additional evidence may be obtained, by inquiring, when this mystery was first revealed. In the *General Advertiser* of the 15th of April, 1786, there appeared a paragraph to the following effect: "When Lord Macartney went to Madras, it is well known, that JUNIUS went with him: He is a native of Ireland, and received his education, in the college of Dublin." The name of Boyd, indeed, was not mentioned, in the foregoing paragraph: But, he was described by his qualities; as *Junius* had, before described Burke, in his prefatory anecdotes. Mrs. Boyd, who then resided at Hampstead, sent a gentleman, on the same morning, that the paragraph appeared, to the printer, with a request, "that no more paragraphs, alluding to *Mr. Boyd*, might appear, in the paper, because she feared, that such information might essentially injure *Mr. Boyd's* interest in India (*d*)."
As neither Mrs. Boyd, nor Mr. Almon, sent that paragraph to the *General Advertiser*, in April, 1786, it follows, from the fact, that some other person strongly suspected Boyd to be the writer of *Junius*, as well as Mr. Almon, and Mrs. Boyd. I do not know, that this subject was again brought before the public,

also stated to me two very important facts: "There is no evidence, in the family [in Ireland,] that Boyd was *Junius*; and yet, it is remarkable, that there has been long an habitual notion, among them, to that effect: When speaking of *Junius*, on his last visit to Ireland, he has been known to say, with confidence, that the author would never be discovered."

(*d*) These anecdotes we also owe to Mr. Almon's unpublished letter before mentioned.

till

till the publication of Almon's *Anecdotes*, in 1797, when Boyd was again described, but not mentioned, as the writer of *Junius* (e). In 1798, Mr. L. D. Campbell, the Editor of the *Indian Observer*, expressly, mentioned Boyd, as the writer of *Junius*; adding, "that before Mr. Boyd went to India, he was suspected by some of the booksellers, as well as his nearest connections, to be [the] author of those letters (f)." The Editor has collected other circumstances, for the purpose of proving his point; which, to mention here, would not at all strengthen my chain of evidence. In 1799, I affirmed the same position; saying, in my *Supplemental Apology*, that I had seen documents, which had convinced me, that *M^r Aulay-Boyd was the writer of Junius's Letters*. I have, since, reviewed my documents, considered his character, and compared his several writings with each other: And, from this re-examination, I am now induced to say, that I regard it, as a *moral certainty*, that *M^r Aulay-Boyd* did write the letters of *Junius*.

Of all the characters, however, who knew Boyd, personally, I have only met with one gentleman, who is of opinion, that he was able to write *Junius's Letters*, and that he was actually the writer of them. But, did the acquaintances of Boyd know him? Had they studied his character? Did they discover, that he was a very able, and a very artful man, even at the age of twenty-one? Did they study what he *did* write; in order to enable them to judge what he *could* write?

(e) *Anecdotes*, vol. i. p. 11—17.

(f) Preface, xvii.

From these questions, we are naturally led into an investigation of the human character. It was only from the writings of Pope, who did not figure in conversation, that Lord Oxford knew, what finished productions his frequent guest could dictate. From the conversation of Psalmanazer, the university of Oxford never discovered his imposture. From the conversation of Lauder, did Johnson consider, that he was throwing away his patronage on an impostor? Did Horace Walpole discover, from the correspondence of Chatterton, what such a boy could forge, or write? Did Edmund Burke imagine, when he received M'Aulay-Boyd into his family, that he had admitted to his intimacy a writer, who would palm upon him his own productions? Did the friends of Mathias learn from his conversation, that he had the malignity to conceive, or the pen to scribble, the *Pursuits of Literature*? No: By his friends I have been told a thousand times, that his spirit was too mild, and his talents were too feeble, for the execution of a lampoon, so malevolent, and extensive: Yet, is it a *moral certainty*, that Mathias wrote, and published, the *Pursuits of Literature*. The answers to those questions, then, appear to inculcate, that it is not acquaintance, nor intimacy, with him, that can discover the true character of any man, who is by nature subtle, and by practice sly.

It is not, therefore, for those, who knew M'Aulay-Boyd upon the town, before his character was ascertained, or his talents were tried, to say, negatively, against so many affirmative proofs, that HE was neither the writer of Junius's Letters, nor capable of writing them.

This

This conclusion has been already, in a great measure, anticipated: For, I have before shown, that Chatterton, a younger person than M^r Aulay; a greater genius; a political writer of equal powers was busily employed, during the same period, in imposing on credulity, and in misleading weakness. I have proved, by examples, that *Junius* was neither so high, nor *M^r Aulay* so low, as too many suppose. I have compared the principles, and peculiarities, of both; their topicks of argument, and figures of style. I will now offer a comparative specimen of each, taken from the first letter of *Junius* (g), and from the first paper of *the Whig* (h):

JUNIUS. 21st Jan. 1769.

The Whig. Nov. 1779.

“ The submission of a free
 “ people to the executive autho-
 “ rity of government is no more
 “ than a compliance with laws,
 “ which they themselves have
 “ enacted. While the national
 “ honour is firmly maintained
 “ abroad, and while justice is
 “ impartially administered at
 “ home, the obedience of the
 “ subject will be voluntary,
 “ chearful, and I might almost
 “ say unlimited. A generous
 “ nation is grateful even for
 “ the preservation of its rights,
 “ and willingly extends the re-
 “ spect due to the office of a
 “ good

“ I trust that neither my name
 “ nor principles are obsolete;
 “ though I am aware that the
 “ name is not in such respect,
 “ nor the principles *yet* so active,
 “ as at the period of the Revolu-
 “ tion. But, if I did not feel
 “ myself warranted, in the hope
 “ that I address a powerful body
 “ of my countrymen, when I
 “ call on my brethren of *The*
 “ *good old Cause*, I would not
 “ waste my labour on a despe-
 “ rate theme, nor profane the
 “ doctrine of liberty, by dis-
 “ cussing it to unanimous slaves.
 “ Whiggism we have seen
 “ triumphant

(g). Gen. Ed. vol. 1. p. 1.

(h). Alm. Anec. vol. 3. p. 1.

“ good prince into an affection
 “ for his person. Loyalty, in
 “ the heart and understanding
 “ of an Englishman, is a rational
 “ attachment to the guardian of
 “ the laws. Prejudices and
 “ passions have sometimes car-
 “ ried it to a criminal length;
 “ and, whatever foreigners may
 “ imagine, we know that Eng-
 “ lishmen have erred as much
 “ in a mistaken zeal for parti-
 “ cular persons and families, as
 “ they ever did in defence of
 “ what they thought most dear
 “ and interesting to themselves.

“ It naturally fills us with re-
 “ sentment, to see such a temper
 “ insulted and abused. In read-
 “ ing the history of a free peo-
 “ ple, whose rights have been
 “ invaded, we are interested in
 “ their cause. Our own feel-
 “ ings tell us how long they
 “ ought to have submitted, and
 “ at what moment it would have
 “ been treachery to themselves
 “ not to have resisted. How
 “ much warmer will be our re-
 “ sentment, if experience should
 “ bring the fatal example home
 “ to ourselves.

“ The situation of this coun-
 “ try is alarming enough to
 “ rouse the attention of every
 “ man, who pretends to a con-
 “ cern for the public welfare.
 “ Appearances justify suspicion;

“ and

“ triumphant in America. Whig-
 “ gism we see preparing her
 “ triumph in Ireland. Let us
 “ hope, let us prove, that her
 “ sacred flame is not extinct in
 “ England.

“ If a slave of power shrink
 “ from the mention of the good
 “ old cause, or, in the callous
 “ impudence of servitude, pre-
 “ sume to villify it, I pity his
 “ wretchedness, I despise his in-
 “ solence; but I would punish
 “ his treason to the constitution.

“ The good old cause is the
 “ cause of the people. Simple
 “ and obvious is this considera-
 “ tion; that *the cause of the peo-
 “ ple is successful exactly in pro-
 “ portion to the energy of their ori-
 “ ginal power.* Such energy,
 “ acting through the classes of
 “ the constitution, which the
 “ people made, preserves their
 “ liberty as a people, and their
 “ power as a nation; for it
 “ watches integrity, and pro-
 “ vides ability, in the persons
 “ they permit to administer
 “ their affairs. Various and in-
 “ tricate, on the contrary, are
 “ the means conducive to *their*
 “ cause; ambition, avarice, or
 “ sloth, would enslave, impo-
 “ verish, or lose their country.
 “ Rectitude has only one direc-
 “ tion, but the obliquity of
 “ treachery is infinite.

“ The

" and when the safety of a na-
 " tion is at stake, suspicion is a
 " just ground of enquiry. Let
 " us enter into it with candour
 " and decency. Respect is due
 " to the station of ministers;
 " and, if a resolution must at
 " last be taken, there is none so
 " likely to be supported with
 " firmness, as that which has
 " been adopted with modera-
 " tion. Without much politi-
 " cal sagacity, or any extraordi-
 " nary depth of observation, we
 " need only mark how the prin-
 " cipal departments of the state
 " are bestowed, and look no far-
 " ther for the true cause of
 " every mischief that befalls
 " us."

" The direction in which the
 " people of this country act,
 " when they act rightly, is,
 " through the parliament which
 " they have elected, to the
 " throne which they have raised.
 " If wickedness or weakness be
 " found in the counsels or coun-
 " sellors of the crown, parlia-
 " ment is the instrument ap-
 " pointed to punish or to dis-
 " miss; but if the instrument
 " fail, the land will exert her
 " native strength. The people,
 " of original right as a free
 " people, will vindicate the
 " country, correct their parlia-
 " ment, and reform their
 " throne."

Such is the similarity of the two papers, by the same
 writer, at the distance of ten years, that the acutest
 critic cannot tell *Junius* from the *Whig*; if you allow
 him, only, the use of his understanding, by shutting
 his eyes to the signatures. It is not, therefore, consist-
 ent with the good sense of those, who have hazarded
 their opinions, that the writer of the one was unequal
 to the writing of the other. I will submit to the judi-
 cious reader, another specimen of the same writer, under
 different signatures; in order that the topicks, as well
 as the style, may more manifestly appear:

The

The sentiments of JUNIUS, on the maxim, that *the King can do no wrong* :

[Gen. Ed. Preface, p. xxvii.]

“ Some opinion may now be
 “ expected from me, upon a
 “ point of equal delicacy to the
 “ writer, and hazard to the
 “ printer. When the character
 “ of the chief magistrate is in
 “ question, more must be under-
 “ stood, than may be safely ex-
 “ pressed. If it be really a part
 “ of our constitution, and not a
 “ mere *dictum* of the law, *that*
 “ *the King can do no wrong*, it is
 “ not the only instance, in the
 “ wisest of human institutions,
 “ where theory is at variance
 “ with practice.—That the so-
 “ vereign of this country is not
 “ amenable to any form of trial,
 “ known to the laws, is unques-
 “ tionable. But exemption from
 “ punishment is a singular pri-
 “ vilege annexed to the royal
 “ character, and no way ex-
 “ cludes the possibility of de-
 “ serving it. How long, and
 “ to what extent a king of
 “ *England* may be protected by
 “ the forms, when he violates
 “ the spirit of the constitution,
 “ deserves to be considered. A
 “ mistake in this matter proved
 “ fatal to *Charles* and his son.
 “ For my own part, far from
 “ thinking that the king can do
 “ no wrong, far from suffering
 “ myself

The sentiments of the WHIG, on the maxim, that *the King can do no wrong* :

[Alm. Anec. v. 3. App. p. 6-7.]

“ When a monarch in this
 “ country, sprung from what-
 “ ever line, adorned with what-
 “ ever hopes from the glories of
 “ his ancestry, or his own ori-
 “ ginal virtues, persists in coun-
 “ sels that do grievous wrong,
 “ and threaten instant ruin;
 “ affection is lost in duty. Du-
 “ ty to the country demands dis-
 “ cussion of a maxim, which,
 “ if the construction of the
 “ court were permitted, would
 “ sanctify every public crime,
 “ and establish public calamity.
 “ Duty to the prince, as part of
 “ the constitution formed by
 “ the people, enjoins constitu-
 “ tional explanation to him of a
 “ phrase, which flattery has
 “ rendered fatal to tyrants.

“ When it is truly said, that
 “ the king can do no wrong,
 “ the office is intended and not
 “ the person; and this true con-
 “ struction is the perfect praise
 “ of our admirable constitution.
 “ The king of *England* can do
 “ no wrong; for it is not the office
 “ of the king *to do* any thing.
 “ The cautious wisdom of our
 “ policy will not permit the
 “ king to act. It not only sup-
 “ poses, but requires, that abi-
 “ lity shall be selected from the
 “ people

" myself to be deterred or im-
 " posed upon by the language
 " of forms, in opposition to the
 " substantial evidence of truth, if
 " it were my misfortune to live
 " under the inauspicious reign
 " of such a prince, I would not
 " scruple to declare to him —
 " ' You have no enemies, sir, but
 " those, who persuade you to
 " aim at power without right,
 " and who think it flattery to
 " tell you that the character of
 " king dissolves the natural re-
 " lation between guilt and pu-
 " nishment.' — The house of
 " commons are only interpre-
 " ters, whose duty it is to con-
 " vey the sense of the people
 " faithfully to the crown. If the
 " interpretation be false or im-
 " perfect, the constituent powers
 " are called upon to deliver
 " their own sentiments. Their
 " speech is rude, but intelli-
 " gible; — their gestures fierce,
 " but full of explanation. Per-
 " plexed by sophistries, their
 " honest eloquence rises into
 " action. Their first appeal was
 " to the integrity of their repre-
 " sentatives: — the second to the
 " King's justice; — the last argu-
 " ment of the people, whenever
 " they have recourse to it, will
 " carry more perhaps than per-
 " suasion to parliament, or sup-
 " plication to the throne.' —

[Gen. Ed. v. 2. p. 89.]

" people to execute the active
 " duties of the state. Even in
 " the selection of such active
 " ability for public service, the
 " king, as we are now consider-
 " ing him, cannot do wrong.
 " For the consideration supposes
 " him in his constitutional pub-
 " lic character; a character con-
 " ferred on him, conditionally,
 " by the people. The condi-
 " tion of his royalty is a wise
 " and honest administration of
 " the state. It is impossible,
 " therefore, in constitutional
 " contemplation, that a *King of*
 " *England* should appoint inca-
 " pable or unworthy men to ad-
 " minister public affairs; or, if
 " appointed, that *the people of*
 " *England* should permit them
 " to be retained; that a free
 " people should sacrifice their
 " original rights and constitu-
 " tive power to such abuse of
 " the kingly office. The un-
 " fairness of arguing from such
 " abuse is evident. The kingly
 " office so abused would no
 " longer belong to the consti-
 " tution. It is a monstrous
 " case, and out of the suppo-
 " sition of fair reasoning. — *Ob-*
 " *stinate* adherence, therefore,
 " to such a principle, induces
 " the inevitable alternative of
 " slavery in the people, or the
 " personal responsibility of ma-
 " jesty. The latter has a pre-
 " cedent, in our history; the
 " former has no example."

It

It thus appears, that rancorous enmity to the person of the King was one of the most distinguishing characteristics of M'Aulay Boyd, under whatever signature he wrote. It was this odious propensity, which induced Mr. Horne to say: "Whatever may be the state of politics in this country, the principles of Junius will suit no form of government (*i*). They are not to be tolerated under any constitution. Personal enmity is a motive fit only for the devil. Whoever, or whatever, is sovereign, demands the respect and support of the people (*k*).¹" What was

(*i*) *Junius* himself complains, "that he was disowned, as a dangerous auxiliary, by every party in the kingdom." [Let. xlv. Gen. Ed. vol. 2. p. 151.]—No wonder! His principles, and practices, were only fit for a party of *United-Irishmen*. See his Letter of the 24th of July 1771, which is too gross to be repeated.

(*k*) *Ib.* 2 vol. p. 226:—The letters of Junius are, historically, noticed by Mr. William Belsham, as written in a masterly style; yet, as being little else than splendid declamation, and poignant invective, which discovered a deliberate malignity of disposition; and which now excite disgust rather than admiration. Adverting to Junius's charges against the Duke of Bedford, the Duke of Grafton, and Sir William Draper, the historian justly remarks, that as the author of such malignant accusations basely shrinks from subsequent investigation, though repeatedly called on, he "stands recorded to all future times, as a LIAR, an ASSASSIN, and a COWARD." Yet, Mr. William Belsham appears not to have been so much affected by Junius's traitorous attempts upon the King's person, as by his anonymous accusations of the old Duke of Bedford, the present Duke of Grafton, and the late Sir William Draper: For, Mr. William Belsham proceeds, narratively, to lay before his readers, "the most striking and faithful picture" of his administration, which was submitted to the King, by this LIAR, and ASSASSIN. [See the History of Great Britain from the Revolution till the Conclusion of the Session of 1793, 4to. vol. 2.

was thus, fitly, said by Mr. Horne, almost thirty years ago, I apply, at present, to *the Whig*, to *the Antrim Freeholder*, and to M'Aulay Boyd, without any rancour to his person, which I never knew; but, with abhorrence of his principles, which are, in themselves, detestable. I said, in my *Supplemental Apology*, that M'Aulay was an *United Irishman*, without meaning to say, that he was of a society, which, in his time, did not formally exist. But, his jacobinical maxims, and his anarchical practices, appeared to me to be such, as to constitute him, one of the legitimate progenitors of that subtle sect.

I have now shown, by examples, that those, who have said, that M'Aulay Boyd could not write *Junius*, had little studied his genuine writings. But, of *negative arguments*, however absurd, when placed in opposition to *affirmative proofs*, there is no end. The publication of my *Supplemental Apology* seems to have given rise to a contest, and to inquiries, in the newspapers, and literary journals, which consist almost wholly of *negative proofs*. The parties did not pretend to know any thing, affirmatively, of *the Author of Junius*: They, only, insist, that every other person was full as ignorant as themselves: They claim the honour, however, of "exposing an attempt to mislead the world by a *pretended discovery* of that
" *incom-*

p. 166—7.] Mr. W. Belsham might have found satisfactory evidence to prove, that *Junius* republished, in his *Genuine Edition*, several charges against the Duke of Bedford, which he must have known to be untrue. Several persons, who had tasted the Duke's bounty, avowed, in the *News-papers*, their gratitude for his generosity. These fugitive documents have been preserved in the *Scots Mag.* 1769. p. 573—5.

"*incomparable author*(1)." Yet, this *pretended discovery* has, actually, existed upwards of thirty years. Truth tried to triumph over falsehood, seventeen years after the first discovery: But, *interest* stepped out to the aid of *fiction*. The truth made another attempt to gain upon the world a dozen years afterwards: But, as neither interest, nor malevolence, opposed her progress, she advanced with more confident steps. Whether the present endeavours of truth, to gain a final triumph over the impertinence of negative assumptions, the malignity of affected fairness, and the dogmatism of critical prejudice, must be left to *experience*, which declares: *Magna est veritas et prævalet*.

Among the negative witnesses, who merit attention, are Mr. H. S. Woodfall, the original printer, and Mr. William Woodfall, the first inspector of Junius's letters; who both have said, that Boyd was not the writer of Junius's epistles. As to the first; we

(1) In the *True Briton* of the 31st August 1799, appeared the following paragraph, from the well known pen of one of the most active of the PHILO JUNIUS's: "Some malevolent wittings are attempting to be facetious on the writers, who have lately employed their pens on the subject of JUNIUS. But, it should be observed, that those writers did not come forward under the idea of *discovering Junius*, but of exposing an attempt to mislead the world, by a *pretended discovery* of that incomparable author. To some men, however, the prevalence of truth, or falsehood, is a matter of indifference; or, rather, perhaps, they feel a malignant pleasure when *falsehood* is triumphant." Yes; swindlers are apt to talk about *impositions on the world*; as thieves are very ready to cry out "Stop thief!" And one of the most malevolent writers, in the present day, comes forth, with a very happy grace, to complain of the malignant pleasure, which some persons take in giving a triumph to falsehood.

have it in evidence, that when applied to, both directly, and indirectly, in 1769, he said, "that those letters came to him in such a manner, that he did not inquire after, or *know the writer*, at that time." It does not appear, that the original printer was much better informed, at the end of eight-and-twenty years: For, a few weeks after the publication of Almon's *Anecdotes*, in 1797, Mr. H. S. Woodfall, meeting the Anecdote writer, at Longman's shop, complimented him, on his entertaining book; "but said that he was mistaken, in supposing Mr. Boyd to have been the author of Junius's Letters; and then added, with an *emphasis*, "that Mr. Boyd was not the author of them." To these emphatical observations, Mr. Almon replied, "that he had no doubt of Mr. Boyd's being the author of those letters; that as you, Mr. H. S. Woodfall, never knew who was the author, you cannot undertake to say, who was *not* the author of those letters (1)." Mr. Woodfall departed, without making any reply. What reply could

(1) This conversation of the printer, and the bookseller, is given from Mr. Almon's unpublished letter before mentioned; and it happened before Mr. Longman, his partner, Mr. Rees, and some of their clerks, says Almon, in his printed letter of the 13th of August 1799. Mr. W. Woodfall, plainly, misconceived what Mr. Almon said of his brother's conversation, in Longman's shop: For, he did not say, that H. S. Woodfall acknowledged, "he never knew who the writer of Junius was." Mr. Almon only argued, *hypothetically*, "as you never knew the author, you ought *not* to say who *was not* the author." I will suppose an issue joined in Westminster-hall, on a wager laid, whether Boyd wrote Junius's Letters; and that Almon, and the two Woodfalls are the witnesses: Almon, for the affirmative; and the other two for

could he make? It is absurd in any man, who does not know the true author of Junius's letters, to say, that M'Aulay Boyd was *not* the writer of them, in opposition to affirmative proofs. Yet, Mr. H. S. Woodfall afterwards told Mr. L. D. Campbell, that "Mr. Boyd was *not* the writer of Junius's Letters," without pretending, however, that he knew the true author. It ought, moreover, to be remembered, that

for the negative. Almon testifies, that Boyd was the writer of Junius's Letters: Why do you think, and say, so? Because, in 1769, suspecting Boyd, I taxed him with being the writer, when he *coloured*; and turned off the conversation by an obvious remark—Have you any other reason? Yes; when I was prosecuted for republishing Junius, I observed, that Boyd, who was in the habit of coming to me two, or three times a week, did not come near me, during the pendency of the prosecution; but, afterwards, called upon me as usual—Have you any other reason? Yes; I do know, that Boyd wrote the *Whig*; and I have thought myself, and been told by gentlemen, who had fifty times more understanding, and learning, than I pretend to, that *the Whig* contains passages of as much force, and elegance, as any in Junius.—A dispassionate judge would consider these asseverations, as very strong affirmative reasons, when coupled with the notorious fact, that Boyd was then a public writer.—On the *negative* question, the two Woodfalls say, That, in their opinions, Boyd did not write Junius. Why do you affirm so? We do not think he was capable of writing Junius. Do you know that Boyd wrote *the Whig*? No: Do you know, that he wrote the *Antrim Freeholder*? No: Do you know what he could write? No: Do you know, who did write Junius? No: Do you know, that Boyd was strongly suspected, thirty years ago, as the writer of Junius? No: Do you know, that Boyd was described as the writer of Junius, in a news-paper, upwards of a dozen years ago? No.—Now; is there any judge, who would not say, that the weight of evidence was for the affirmative? Is there any jury, who would not find for the affirmative side of the issue joined, whether Boyd wrote Junius?

that when *Junius* sent the *corrected edition* of his letters to Mr. H. S. Woodfall, he told the people of England, "*I am the sole depositary of my own secret, and it shall perish with me.*" There is reason to believe, that he persevered, in his purpose, to the end. Yet, says Mr. W. Woodfall, *Junius* promised my brother, "that he would one day let him into the secret." This promise, indeed, may have been made by JUNIUS, before his engagement to the public, that *his secret should perish with him*. It is now self-evident, that H. S. Woodfall never was so far let into the secret, as to know the true author of *Junius's* letters.

Mr. William Woodfall came forward, like an *amicus curiæ*, to give his voluntary testimony, on this litigated question: And he says, in substance, that the writer of *Junius* published, in *The Public Advertiser*, under the several signatures of *Lucius*, of *Junius*, and of *Brutus*, exclusive of the auxiliary signature of *Phil-Junius*; that his brother shewed him, before the publication, every one of those letters [under all those signatures] in manuscript, "which bore no appearance of being written in a disguised hand (*n*);" that during the splendid period of *Junius's* publication

[1769]

(*n*) We have it in evidence, "that previous to the appearance of *Junius*, Boyd was at wonderful pains, in accustoming himself to disguise his hand-writing."—It would require strong proof, indeed, to satisfy a reasonable mind, that the writer of *Junius's* Letters would send them to the printer in his real hand-writing. It is impossible to conceive, that such a man, as Boyd, would take such successful pains to disguise his hand-writing, if he had not had some design to deceive the world. He employed also his wife to write for him some of his letters; viz. that to Sir Fletcher Norton, &c.

[1769-1770-1771] Mr. Hugh Boyd was likewise in the habit of corresponding with *The Public Advertiser*, without being studious to conceal himself (o); that, however, he might disguise his hand-writing, which cannot easily be so disguised, as to deceive the acute discernment of a news-paper printer, Boyd could not, as all must admit, disguise his style, and "least of all, "in that most extraordinary way of writing infinitely "above his own reach of literary talents:" that in the same period, "the writer of Junius sent several private letters to his brother, some of them containing letters to individuals of distinguished characters, "which he requested his brother to convey (p)."

The curious world is much obliged to Mr. W. Woodfall, for this voluntary evidence. It is an important fact, that Boyd lived in London, during the years 1769, 1770, and 1771; and, in these years, was in the frequent practice of corresponding with the printer of the *Public Advertiser*; because this fact precludes the notion of an *alibi*: It is a fact, of less importance, that the writer of Junius, sent to the printer,

(o) This fact shows Boyd to have been a very artful man: For, by not studying to be concealed, as *Boyd*, he effectually concealed himself, as *Junius*, and deluded the printers, with all their pretensions to deep sagacity.

(p) It is in evidence, however, that Boyd sometimes employed his wife to carry to the printer's box many letters, which were written, in his disguised hand; the contents of which she did not know. A man, who could employ his wife, on such errands, could easily find a woman in Fleet-street, who would step to the neighbouring printer, with any kind of letters. Here, then, is an additional proof, that Boyd was a very artful person, who knew perfectly the true secret of conveying his political letters with perfect safety.

printer, letters for distinguished characters, to be conveyed by him; because, this evidence proves, that Junius was not written by any person of eminence, either in rank, or in literature; as such letters, he must know, could have been sent, by the penny post, with greater secrecy, and more safety: But, the fact does not either prove, or disprove, that Boyd was *not* the writer of Junius's letters; neither does the evidence, about the similarity of hand-writing, prove any thing, in this question; as it is impossible for the acutest printer to tell, what disguises an artful man can assume. But, this voluntary witness does not bring any satisfactory evidence, either to prove his own *negative*, or to impugn the *affirmative* of others. He shows, plainly, that he does not know the writer of Junius; and of course evinces, that he ought to be less positive in his assertions, and less free in his charges. To the logic, which assumes the very point, which he ought to prove, I say nothing, in reprobation. But, his want of proof, and deficiency of argument, he supplies, *Junius-like*, by some *imagery*. Our *Amicus Curie* observes "that Boyd's composition, though tolerably adapted to winter wear, like a frieze home-spun great coat, is not to be compared to the super-fine broad cloth of JUNIUS, manufactured from the best Spanish wool, and equally ornamental, and serviceable, in all seasons." If it were proper to dispute about *taste*, I would say, that I regard *Junius*, as only an *Irish* POPLIN, which may glitter on a birth day; but, is quite unfit, for daily use, in any season.

But, let us examine a sample, or two, of Boyd's *frieze home-spun*, as we see it, in *The Indian Observer*, which

is the only remarkable stuff of our manufacturer, that Mr. W. Woodfall appears to have ever handled, except Junius. Speaking of IMPERIAL ROME, BOYD observes (*q*): “ While we contemplate the immortal
“ monuments of learning, and genius, of philosophy,
“ oratory, and poetry, which *she* has bequeathed to
“ the admiration of posterity; we are condemned, at
“ the same time, to view, with a sigh for the imper-
“ fection of our nature, the follies, that disgraced her
“ wisdom, and the vices, that sullied her glories. More
“ fatal, than the most hostile arms, according to the
“ satirist, luxury undermined the greatness, invin-
“ cible to every other foe; and the victors of man-
“ kind, vanquished by themselves, gave to the world
“ the revenge it could not take.” Pray, is there any
better cloth to be found, in the shop of JUNIUS, than
we have thus from the homely hand of our manufac-
turer of frieze? Phoh, Sir, *homespun*!

Why; then, let us try another sample. Speaking
of the two most powerful, and persevering, passions
of the human heart, Boyd observes (*r*): “ Ambi-
“ tion, and avarice, would seem to be as remote, in
“ their nature, and as contradistinguished in their
“ principle, and object, as any two dispositions of the
“ mind. Yet, however more brilliant the colours,
“ and *costume*, of the one, than of the other, they will
“ be found wonderfully to approximate in their design,
“ and composition. In support of this apparent pa-
“ radox, the fact might be observed, of their often
“ finding their place in the same breast. Two nota-
“ ble instances occur, in modern, and ancient, his-

(*q*) Observer, No. 2. Campbell's edit. p. 48.

(*r*) Observer, No. 4. Camp. edit. p. 58.

“ tory,

“tory, of equal avarice of military glory, and private
 “profit. The princely possessor of Bienheim, while
 “he directed the storm, and decided the fortune of
 “war, was no less attentive to his own. He “saved
 “a nation, and he saved a groat.” Nor, were the
 “occasional attentions of his Grace’s prototype, the
 “victorious Crassus, less famous or certain. While
 “his Roman eagles pursued the defeat, not a Roman
 “in the ranks was more attentive to the plunder of
 “the flying Parthian.

“But without insisting on examples, let these lead-
 “ing qualities be fairly considered in the abstract;
 “and let the consideration be divested of the glare
 “which surrounds the one, and the prejudicial mist
 “that obscures the other, distinction and pre-emi-
 “nence are the objects of both; and ardent attention
 “and unwearied perseverance, are their mutual prin-
 “ciples. It is true, that the pre-eminence ambitioned
 “by the one, and the distinction coveted by the other,
 “are somewhat different in their specific *nature* (*s*).
 “But this is rather a nominal, than a real objection to
 “the position, and is founded more on accident, than
 “on any intrinsic or essential difference.—If such be
 “the proximity of the passions, let due consideration
 “be used to distinguish them, and candour to appre-
 “ciate; and, if such be their power, let proportionate
 “care be exerted to regulate and direct them. Let
 “it be remembered, according to the expressive meta-
 “phor of our moral poet, that they are only “the

(*s*) See the ungrammatical pen of Junius! Boyd is speaking of *two* natures; and he applies to them *nature*, in the singular; as may be frequently seen, in the preceding page.

“ “gales

““gales of life,” and let reason stand to the helm!”—
Is not this broad cloth? Phoh, Sir, only *frieze*!

As fastidiousness is ever hard to please, let us examine another sample! Speaking on the subject of female occupations, Boyd observes: (1) “If I might
“be indulged with leave to suggest the subject of
“reading, which appears to unite the useful and the
“pleasing, more than any other, I should point to the
“muse whom Mr. Addison selected for his signature
“to the *Spectator*; the muse of history. Clio unites
“all the interest of her sister muses of the drama, with
“the maxims of truth, and doctrines of philosophy;
“whose precepts, in her sacred page, are recommended
“and fortified by the most brilliant examples, from
“the real drama of the world. Plutarch, it may be
“presumed, will be found rather more instructive,
“and not less entertaining, than the lives and loves of
“a circulating library. The death of Arria with her
“husband, is surely as interesting, and at least as moral,
“as the motley exit of Eloisa, lamenting her lover,
“and careless of her lord. Or, to come to examples
“nearer the present manners, is not the fourth Henry
“of France as respectable a rake as any noble *Rué de*
“Paris, and was not our own Sir Philip Sydney as
“accomplished a knight as even Sir Charles Grandison?
“Rollin, who was no less a critic of taste than an
“historian of eminence, has proved how much the
“latter capacity contributed to the former. His
“*Belle Assemblée* owed much to his *Histoire Ancienne*;
“and, certainly, the subject received reflected ad-

(1) Observer, No X. Campb. ed. p. 105.

“vantage

“vantage from the charms of the discussion. Never, indeed; can knowledge appear so lovely, as when adorned with female elegance; nor ever are the attractions of the sex so irresistible, as when beauty is refined by understanding.”—Phoh, Sir, Phoh!!

“What *hempen homespuns* have we swaggering here,

“So near the cradle of the fairy queen!!!

Well: The declamations of *Junius* are, doubtless, different from the discourses of *The Observer*. *Junius* is *disputative*; the *Observer* is *didactic*: *Junius* abounds in all the dexterities of sophistry, in the poignancy of invective, and the energies of sedition: The business of *the Observer* is not to dispute, but to instruct; not to irritate, but to please; not to offend by opposition, but to attract general approbation, by exhibiting splendid views of familiar objects: The comparison, therefore, of these two writers, is not quite fair; since they were written upon such different principles, with such opposite aims. Let us, then, compare a sample of the same writer, under different signatures, when both his end, and his means, were the same; as they appear in *Junius* (u), and the *Whig* (x):

JUNIUS to Lord Mansfield, the
Chief Justice, January 1772.

THE WHIG to Lord Thurlow,
the Chancellor, in Jan. 1780.

“I have undertaken to prove
“that when, at the intercession
“of three of your countrymen,
“you bailed *John Eyre*, you did
“that, *which by law you were*

“I have acknowledged your
“rank, my Lord, and your
“high titles, with the pleasure
“that every liberal mind feels
“in doing justice to an eminent
“character.

“not

(u) Gen. edit. Vol. II. p. 309.

(x) Almon's Anecdotes, Vol. III. Appendix, p. 17.

"not warranted to do, and that
 "a felon, under the circum-
 "stances, of being taken in the
 "fact, with the stolen goods upon
 "him, and making no defence, is
 "not bailable by the laws of
 "England. Your learned ad-
 "vocates have interpreted this
 "charge into a denial that the
 "Court of King's-Bench, or the
 "Judges of that Court during
 "the vacation, have any greater
 "authority to bail for criminal
 "offences, than a justice of peace.
 "With the instance before me,
 "I am supposed to question your
 "power of doing wrong, and
 "to deny the existence of a
 "power, at the same moment
 "that I arraign the illegal ex-
 "ercise of it. But the opinions
 "of such men, whether wilful
 "in their malignity, or sincere
 "in their ignorance, are un-
 "worthy of my notice. You,
 "Lord Mansfield, did not un-
 "derstand me so, and, I promise
 "you, your cause requires an
 "abler defence.—I am now to
 "make good my charge against
 "you. However dull my argu-
 "ment, the subject of it is in-
 "teresting. I shall be honoured
 "with the attention of the pub-
 "lic, and have a right to de-
 "mand the attention of the Re-
 "gislation. Supported, as I am,
 "by the whole body of the cri-
 "minal

"character. Every man is ready
 "to confess, that they have been
 "earned by abilities as superior,
 "as the independence and honour
 "ought to be, which alone can
 "dignify their nature or justify
 "their tenure. But, there, my
 "Lord, on that cardinal point,
 "the public judgement has been
 "long suspended. If I add, that
 "the scale is now rapidly de-
 "scending against you, and that
 "the wonder of your talents
 "avails only to give weight and
 "acceleration to the censure of
 "your conduct, your Lordship
 "will confess the justice of your
 "country, when you recollect
 "yourself, and look round on
 "the men whose cause you con-
 "descend to plead.

"One of that public who de-
 "lighted in admiring, and who
 "now exercise with pain their
 "rights of judging you, I yet
 "offer myself to your Lordship
 "as your friend. And though
 "the friendship of honest re-
 "proof be in general equally
 "thankless and fruitless, I rely
 "on the manliness of your mind
 "for its public effect in this
 "instance, and even for your
 "Lordship's gratitude.

"Before our correspondence
 "proceeds, let me clear its way
 "to your understanding and your
 "approbation.

"This

"minal law of England, I have
 "no doubt of establishing my
 "charge. If, on your part, you
 "should have no plain, substan-
 "tial defence, but should endea-
 "vour to shelter yourself under
 "the quirk and evasion of a
 "practising lawyer, or under the
 "mere, insulting assertion of
 "power without right, the repu-
 "tation you pretend to, is gone
 "for ever;—you stand degraded
 "from the respect and authority
 "of your office, and are no
 "longer, *de jure*, Lord Chief
 "Justice of England. This let-
 "ter, my Lord, is addressed, not
 "so much to you, as to the pub-
 "lic. Learned as you are, and
 "quick in apprehension, few
 "arguments are necessary to
 "satisfy you, that you have
 "done that, which by law you
 "were not warranted to do.
 "Your conscience already tells
 "you, that you have sinned
 "against knowledge, and that
 "whatever defence you make,
 "contradicts your own internal
 "conviction. But other men are
 "willing enough to take the law
 "upon trust. They rely upon
 "your authority, because they
 "are too indolent to search for
 "information; or, conceiving
 "that there is some mystery in
 "the laws of their country,
 "which lawyers only are qua-

"This letter is written, and
 "unless rendered unnecessary,
 "more shall be addressed to your
 "Lordship, not as a public man
 "who influences public affairs,
 "but as the Dictator of the State
 "who decides them; I do not
 "say immediately in council,
 "but certainly in effect. Your
 "Lordship already understands
 "me, and so will the people be-
 "fore our correspondence closes.
 "In the mean time I state my-
 "self to your Lordship and my
 "country, not alone justified but
 "impelled to represent you to
 "yourself, and explain you to
 "the public, in all your present
 "power and all its fatal con-
 "sequence; impelled, by what
 "your own nervous eloquence
 "too consciously describes "the
 " "abundant danger and exi-
 " "gence of the time."

"I do not argue unfairly
 "with your Lordship, when I
 "assume the fact of our mis-
 "government for the last ten
 "years. *I know* the contempt
 "with which the superiority of
 "your mind has looked down
 "to the wretchedness of the
 "administration.

"I admire the emphatic zeal
 "for your own dignity, with
 "which you have ever dis-
 "claimed all fellowship, even
 "personal acquaintance, with
 "the

“ lified to explain, they distrust
“ their judgement, and volun-
“ tarily renounce the right of
“ thinking for themselves. With
“ all the evidence of history
“ before them, from *Tresillian* to
“ *Jefferies*, from *Jefferies* to *Mans-*
“ *field*, they will not believe it
“ possible that a learned judge
“ can act in direct contradiction
“ to those laws, which he is sup-
“ posed to have made the study
“ of his life, and which he has
“ sworn to administer faithfully.
“ Superstition is certainly not
“ the characteristic of this age,
“ Yet some men are bigoted
“ in politics, who are infidels in
“ religion.—I do not despair of
“ making them ashamed of their
“ credulity.”

“ the Prime Minister. And it
“ was in these sentiments that I
“ hoped, and the public expected,
“ my Lord, you would have dis-
“ dained all continuance of pub-
“ lic connection with him. A
“ man of spirit, it was concluded
“ that you would not devote
“ yourself for ever to pusillani-
“ mity and dishonour; a man of
“ activity and vigour, it was
“ deemed impossible that you
“ should be rivetted to indolence
“ and lethargy, and that the
“ only exertion of your great
“ talents should be in defence of
“ ignorance, and insensibility,
“ which they had attempted in
“ vain to inform, and animate.
“ Such, my Lord, was the per-
“ suasion of a people who were
“ willing to confide at least in
“ your magnanimity: And even
“ yet it is hoped, that you will
“ not thwart your nature, be-
“ cause it happens to concur
“ with your duty.”

He must be a skilful manufacturer, who can distin-
guish the broad cloth of *Junius*, from the woollen
homespun of *The Whig*. But, our critical shopman,
who, no doubt, is an excellent judge of various fa-
bricks, is also, as SWIFT would say, a “ *bel-esprit*, and
a woollen-draper.” But of this enough!—

It is to be lamented, that, in controversial writings,
the parties should so often sacrifice their judgements

to their prejudices; that they should praise without bounds, and condemn without discrimination. The disputants, by praising *Junius*, as an *incomparable writer*, thereby called upon others to point out his faults, and to appreciate his merits. On the other hand, the *Philo-Junius's*, who were alarmed for the fame of their favourite, when they heard M'Aulay-Boyd named, as that *incomparable writer*, tried, by every artifice, to detract from his genuine qualities. When it was said, that he was a poet, in addition to his other accomplishments, as a writer, his detractors exclaimed, *What a Poet!* I do not suppose, that his fondest admirers presumed to think, at the time, of Spenser, Shakspeare, or Milton, of Dryden, Pope, or of Gray. They only meant to say, that he wrote *pretty poetry*. I will submit to the dispassionate reader, three copies of unpublished verses, which were, certainly, written by Hugh M'Aulay-Boyd, and were, kindly, transmitted to me, by my very communicative friend, at Dublin.

I. STANZAS, "on seeing STERNE's Grave, un-
honoured, in the cemetery of St. George's,
Hanover-square:" (y).

"And, is no friendly mourner near!
The last sad office to assume;
O'er his cold grave to drop a tear,
Or, "pluck the nettle from his tomb."

Forgive

(y) The rev. Lawrence Sterne, A M. died on the 18th of
March 1768 [Scot's Mag. 1768, p. 223] and was buried four
days

Forgive me, STERNE, if from thy line,
The sympathetick hint I drew;
The feeling heart must copy thine;
The tender mourner think like you."

II. An IMPROMPTU, upon losing a game at chess, to
Serjeant Adair, who allowed, that it was occa-
sioned by two ladies looking over the chess-
board:—

I.

" 'Tis true, I've lost a game at chess;
But, as things stood, no shame, or wonder;
Reminded now, you must confess,
I gain'd a loss,—without a blunder:

2.

For, while your thoughts were fix'd on board,
Mine were with flesh and blood delighted;
Which, while on senseless queens you por'd,
Better, by far, my thoughts requited.

3.

And, while base bishops, wooden kings,
All your soul mov'd, to make attacks on;
My happier fancy spread its wings,
And soar'd up to Adair, and Jackson.

4. And

days after, in the new burying-ground, belonging to St. George's, Hanover-square; as the parish register shows. His death, which had been long expected, was not much noticed, by our poets. He was, at first, dispraised: He was, thereupon, defended by some verses [Gent. Mag. 1768, p. 191.] Garrick gave him, as an old friend, some metrical praise. [Biog. Dict.] At the end of eighteen years, a poetic epitaph was inscribed on his tomb-stone. [Gent. Mag. 1786, p. 932.] But, the verses of M^r Aulay-Boyd are far superior to those effusions, in pathos, elegance, and point.

4.

And so, you sent them up the stair,
Where, well you knew, my thoughts would follow,
As sure, as greyhound after hare,
Or, after Daphne, swift Apollo,

5.

Nor make, vain Carle, thy empty boast,
Nor vaunt a triumph, such as this is;
Wield you your arms, midst wooden host,
And leave to mine the *better pieces*."

III. AN EPILOGUE to the tragedy of Douglas, when it was acted by the children of his sister, Mrs. Godley: Spoken by Miss A. Godley, who performed the part of Lady Randolph. When Miss R. Godley, in the character of Anna, had finished the account of Lady Randolph's death; her ladyship, running on the stage, spoke, as follows: (z)—

"I ask Miss Rosey's pardon:—'tis not so,
I could not sure so unpolitely go,
Without a curtsie, plunge i'th' "empty air:"
Lord, how it makes a modern widow stare!
Our more substantial, not less fatal flights,
Aspire not to those odious rocky heights;

In

(z) The allusion, through the first part of this epilogue, refers altogether to the death of Lady Randolph, in the last scene of Douglas; to the *rocky precipice*, from which she plunged headlong into the *empty air*: The second part contains a happy compliment to the maternal virtues of Mrs. Godley; the more happy, as it was amply due to her many accomplishments.

In pleasure's lower region we take wing ;
 Not a dead lord ; a living slave's the thing.
 And though we give ourselves some " empty airs,"
 They're not from " rocks"—but boxes above stairs.
 Such is the modern drama of the time,
 A whimsy, tragi-comic pantomime :
 Where clowns and changelings act the foremost parts,
 And where love's plot, alas ! is hands,—not hearts :
 But hold ! sententious satire ill beseems
 A Miss, though at your service, not in teens :
 Far more delighted, she with rapture tells,
 With grateful rapture, what around her dwells.
 The happy scenes, where " love makes duty light ;"
 Where shines, confess, Matilda of to-night,
 Maternal, shines, whilst in their sphere of love,
 Her little satellites around her move,
 Blest with her bright example, we aspire,
 To catch the sparks of virtue's sacred fire ;
 The thought, that elevates, the hope, that glows,
 With lively sympathy, the heart, that knows,
 No other pain, than other's pains create,
 No purer joy, than friends participate."

It has been stated, as a fact, that Boyd told his wife,
 " He was positive the *Heroic Epistle to Sir William*
 " *Chambers* was written by *Junius* ; for the purpose
 " of trying the effect of political satire in verse." (a)
 I have perused the four poems, which are supposed
 to have been written by *Malcolm M'Gregor*, with
 a view to this position : But, I am not prepared to
 say, that *M'Gregor*, and *M'Aulay*, were, and are,
 one

(a) The preface to *The Indian Observer*, xxix.

one and the same satirist. (*b*) If the four satires were written by the same person; if the prefatory date to *The Dean and Squire*, namely, the 1st of May 1782, be the true one; this date would show, that M'Aulay-Boyd could not be the author; because he was then in India; an envoy at Ceylon, or a prisoner at Mauritius. *The Heroic Epistle*, however, was published in May 1773: Junius ceased to write, in January 1772. I am unable to trace the connection, without some other facts, to direct the eye, and to assist the understanding.

On the contrary, this famous epistle has been assigned to Mason, the friend of Gray. It is assumed, first, that he wrote this epistle, although it is so unlike his other poems; it is assumed, secondly, that he was the author of *Junius's* letters; which letters, from his residence, in Yorkshire, he could not easily have written, and which, from his character of the king's chaplain, he was not very likely to have written. (*c*) But,
I will

(*b*) The hunters, when beating the covers, for a fox, sometimes start a badger. In looking for M'Aulay, through *The Foundling Hospital for Wit*, I found Mathias. I saw, from what source this *Pursuer of Literature* had, literally, copied his malignant note about the late Dean Tucker. [Ib. vol. II. p. 37.] I perceived, where he had poached for some of his dissonant rhymes. [Ib. p. 35-136.] I discovered, also, the origin of his *Chinese Epistle*. [Ib. p. 48.] Mathias, too, would fain try the effect of *political*, and *personal* satire, in verse.

(*c*) He died at Ashton, on the 5th of April 1797. There is some account of him in the *Gent. Mag.* 1797, p. 359. By a search in the Lord Chamberlain's office, it has been found, that the rev. William Mason, was appointed chaplain in ordinary to his Majesty, on the 20th of August 1757; that he continued one of the king's

I will not, like the inquisitive poet,

“ ——— my thoughts deceive

“ With hope of *things impossible* to find.”

SUCH are the *documents*, which have convinced me, that Hugh M'Aulay-Boyd was the author of Junius's letters. I submit my argument to the public, without the least emotion either of hope, or fear. Should my opinion prevail, I have no reason to expect the favour of any party, nor the affection of any man: Should it be opposed, I dread nothing, from any writer, whatever may be the answers, which, I learn, are in contemplation; because I have been in the habit of writing, what neither has been answered,

King's chaplains, till the end of the year 1772: So that he was one of his Majesty's chaplains, in ordinary, during the whole period, wherein Junius flourished. There is in the European Mag. 1783, p. 410, a print of Mason, with an account of his life, and writings.

I do not think it at all more probable, that the rev. Philip Rosenhagen, who died in November 1796, was the writer of Junius. He was, says the Gent. Mag. 1796, p. 1059, and 1797, p. 249, “ formerly of St. John's College, Cambridge, where he “ took the degree of A. B. in 1760, gained one of the classical “ prizes given by the representatives of the university, in 1762, and “ took the degree of A. M. in 1763. A report was at one time, “ industriously, circulated, but without any foundation, except to “ flatter his vanity, that he was the author of the letters, signed “ *Junius*.” He was the curate of a parish, in Essex, to which he used to go down, on a Saturday night, with *four horses*. Rosenhagen is said to have been a nephew of Lady Chesterfield: Lord Chesterfield, in one of his letters to his son, tells him, that he had been asked “ to gain over *parson* Rosenhagen; but, that he had declined to interfere in such matters.”

ed, nor could be answered. Experience must determine, whether *this argument* can be answered. By abuse, indeed, it may; the abuse of designed misconception, and purposed misrepresentation; of personal animosity, or literary malevolence. I have, indeed, so little sollicitude about the fate of my opinion, with regard to the author of Junius's epistles, that I would not step across my library, to gain a dozen proselytes. I am prompted, by this indifference, to avow, that neither will abuse provoke me to explain, nor any answer induce me to resume a subject, which appears to create such antipathies in some, and to kindle such inflammation in others, without any adequate cause. My argument, I leave with the intelligent, the ingenuous, part of the nation:

“ If this will not suffice, it must appear,

“ That malice bears down truth.”

I was led to this subject, as I have already intimated, by mere accident. I formed my opinion upon such proofs, as seemed to me to be satisfactory. I have been called upon to deliver to the public my *documents*, which I have now done, as briefly, as the nature of a multifarious investigation allowed. In discharging this duty, I may presume to say, that I am actuated by as pure a love of truth, as any of those, who have been so forward, to boast of their own purity of motive, and to impute improper motives to others. I can have no possible interest in the question, whether Tom Nokes, or John Styles, wrote the seditious letters of Junius, thirty years ago. With Mr. Almon, I never had any acquaintance, nor have
now

now any connection : His politics, and mine, were always so dissimilar, that we never had any attractions for each other : Neither can I, with the frankness of Mr. H. S. Woodfall, compliment him on his *Political Anecdotes* ; a book, which I do not approve, either in its matter, or its manner. Whatever may be the principles of the editor of Boyd's works, I have as little connection with him : I disapprove of the republication of the *political productions* of M'Aulay-Boyd ; because, I consider them as libellous, in the extreme. Whether this declaration will be regarded, by the *antipuffers*, as within any of the definitions of the *puff*, I cannot *divine*. Certain it is, however, that the public has an interest in the exposing of *mystery*. The relatives of those respectable persons, who were said to be the writers of *Junius's* letters, have a right to demand, that his seditious pen may be placed in the proper hand. The illustrious connections of those, who were maligned by Junius, have a similar claim. But, neither the law, nor the manners of England, ever permit the grave to be searched, for objects of punishment, whatever may be their guilt. In this country, the relations of *Junius* have nothing to dread : For one, that would hurt, there are thousands, who would help the widow, and orphans, of the undoubted author. Even I, much as I detest the principles, and despise the practices, of Junius, would protect his relict, if she wanted protection, and would assist his children, if their promotion were within my power. And, with these sentiments, will I close my argument, about the writer of
Junius.

Junius. I have endeavoured well, I trust: And I will conclude, with the manly wish of Granville:

“ Important truths still let my writings hold,
“ And moral mysteries with art unfold.”

THE POSTSCRIPT.

SINCE the foregoing sheets were printed, several documents have been discovered, and facts ascertained, which I beg leave to submit to the inquisitive reader, in the commodious form of suppletory notes:—

In p. 22, it is said, “Edmund Burke relinquished “the pension, which he owed to his connection with “W. G. Hamilton.” When Burke rose to such an height, as enabled him to influence, he applied to the Irish government, for pensions to his poor relations; stating, among other motives, his own merit, in “having resigned his pension, on the Irish establishment.”

In p. 27; “After so many proofs, which carry conviction with them, it is unnecessary to repeat what “Burke said in Parliament, with regard to Junius.”

I will here subjoin what Junius said, with regard to Burke: The Gentleman, who has written, on this subject, several letters, under the signature of VERAX, has told the Public: “I remember frequently conversing with Mr. Boyd about the supposed author “of Junius’s letters; and I told him, that from the “warmth of the writer, and from the pride of the
“pen,

“pen, I could not help thinking, but that Mr. Burke
 “was the author of these letters. I remember very
 “well his reply; “My good fellow, ‘he might be,
 “from the writing, ’tis true, but Mr. Burke was in
 “Ireland, when one of the papers was published.”
 “That did not appear to me a sufficient reason against
 “it. Mr. Burke’s temper exactly corresponded with
 “the title of Junius.—To have written Junius’s let-
 “ters, there must have been a motive and a cause for
 “passion, which Mr. Boyd never felt, or never could
 “have felt, even if he had had the same provocation
 “to it that Mr. Burke had. In short, so much am I
 “convinced, from the temper and constitution of
 “Mr. Burke, that he was the author of Junius’s let-
 “ters, that I could almost persuade myself to believe,
 “that if he did not write them, nobody did (*d*).” From
 the foregoing documents, it must be apparent to every
 body, except to VERAX, that the purpose of Boyd,
 in acquitting Burke, was merely to give the writer
 of VERAX a *put-off*. We have already seen, that JU-
 NIUS attributed his own letters to Burke, and that he
 equally retracted his own imputation, when it suited
 his several designs (*e*). At any rate, the opinion of so
 well-informed a man, as Boyd undoubtedly was, ought
 to have great weight with VERAX; since no other
 person, who has read my *argument*, with attention,
 can have any doubt, about the real author of JUNIUS’s
 letters.

In p. 60: “His mother’s father is said to have died,
 in 1765: But, we are assured, that “the bequest of
 “his maternal grandfather did not fall to him till

(*d*) TRUE BRITON, Dec. 20th.

(*e*) See before, p. 23-5.

“some

“some time after his marriage; and that when he
“got the estate, it was so incumbered with annu-
“tants, and harassed by subsequent litigations, as to
“afford him hardly any relief(*f*).” Time and chance
have put into my hands the “*amended answer*” of
Hugh M’Aulay Boyd to the bill of complaint, which
was filed against him in the Chancery court of Ireland,
under *that name*, by Hugh Boyd, Esq. at some period,
subsequent to the year 1769. This *answer*, which was
signed by Barry Yelverton, the present Lord Chief
Baron of the Exchequer in Ireland; and which must
have been sworn to by Hugh M’Aulay Boyd, throws
complete light upon that obscure transaction: And,
I will, therefore, submit to the reader several apposite
facts, which I have carefully collected from it.

1. It is expressly stated, that Hugh Boyd of Bally-
castle died in 1765, as I have already intimated;
after settling his estates, by will, on his children, and
grandchildren, in strict entail, with contingent remain-
ders, and with trusts, and uses, almost without end.
His estate of *Redbay*, with the lands of Drumacha-
man, and Drumakit, lying in the parish of Laid,
within the barony of Glencarin, and county of An-
trim, he devised to his grandson, Adam Boyd, and
his issue male; and in case of his death, without issue
male, he settled the same estate and lands, in the same
manner, on his grandson, Hugh M’Aulay, and his
issue male, on condition, that he and they took the
name of Boyd: Trustees were appointed by the de-
visor to manage the estate of Adam Boyd, and em-
powered to raise money thereon, for defraying the

(*f*) Preface to *The Indian Observer*, xvi.

charges of his education, and settlement in life: And, it was out of these trusts, that the said Chancery suit arose between one of the surviving Trustees and our Hugh M'Aulay Boyd.

2. It is apparent from the *answer* above mentioned, which is before me, that the education of Adam Boyd was neglected; that his settlement in life was little attended to; that without giving him any notions, or habits, of business, he was allowed, while he was under age, to sail, in the beginning of 1768, with a small adventure to Barbadoes, whence he found his way to Philadelphia, where he died, in December 1768, under twenty-one, and without issue male. Here, then, are the *contingencies*, which let in our Hugh M'Aulay, and his issue male, to the estate of Redbay; that is admitted by him, in his answer, to be worth about *two hundred and sixty pounds*, "over and above the" "incumbrances, thereon induced by the said Hugh Boyd, the testator." The bill of complaint prayed indemnity, for the sum of £.400, which was charged to have been raised by the Trustees under the power of the will, for the use of the said Adam Boyd. The defences set up were, that the surplus rents of the estate were quite sufficient to defray the whole charges of any education, or outfit, which Adam Boyd ever received; that, in fact, no money was ever raised, for any such uses; and that the deceased infant left assets enow, in the hands of his tenants, to pay all his real debts. How the Chancery suit was ultimately determined, I am unable to tell.

3. Soon after the news of Adam Boyd's death arrived in England, Hugh M'Aulay set off for Ireland; took possession of the estate, though he had then only
issue

issue female; and at the same time assumed the name of Boyd; as we may see, in his verified answer to the bill of complaint. It is apparent, from a consideration of every circumstance, that these events must have taken place, during the last week of April 1769. Adam Boyd died, as we have seen, at Philadelphia, in December 1768; the news of this important death would be immediately transmitted by his connections, there, to his trustees in Ireland; and as such news could not be concealed, Alexander M'Auley, who lived in Antrim, would speedily send the interesting information to his brother Hugh, in London: April 1769 is, therefore, the epoch of the assumption of the name of Boyd by our noted author, who, during three months, wrote the famous letters of Junius, while he retained the more democratical, but less dignified name, of M'AULEY (g).

In

(g) Junius published his first letter, as I have often stated, for the uses of recollection, on the 21st of January 1769. Sir William Draper answered him, on the 26th. And during February, and March, Junius was chiefly occupied with this antagonist. The ninth, tenth, and eleventh letters of Junius were dated on the 10th, the 21st, and 24th of April 1769. His next letter was dated on the 30th of the subsequent May. Meanwhile, Sir William Draper published another letter, which was dated from Clifton, on the 24th of April; and which was not answered by Junius, who was generally alert, though Sir William spoke contemptuously of his "*false assertions*," and talked disdainfully of a writer, who "*still skulks in the dark, in the mean subterfuge of a mask*." From these facts, it is plainly inferible, that the writer of Junius was not in England, when this letter was published, on the 1st of May 1769. This letter appeared in the edition of Junius, published in 1771, with "*the Anecdotes of the Author*:" But, it was not republished, in the *genuine edition* of JUNIUS, in 1772. These circumstances, and

K

other

In p. 65: "As his own father did not die opulent, "we may easily suppose, that the son was deprived, "in 1766, at once of the benefit of a father's advice, "and of the resource of a father's purse." In confirmation of these sentiments, I will here subjoin, for the reader's satisfaction, an attested copy of the last will of Alexander M'Auley, who died, as we have seen [before, p. 53], on the 13th of July 1766:

"In the name of God, Amen. I, Alexander
"M'Auley, of the city of Dublin, esquire, Do make
"this my last will and testament, in manner following:
"I devise all my real estate to my kinsman James
"Stewart, of Coleraine, esquire, my son-in-law John
"Godley, esquire, and my eldest son Alexander
"M'Auley, Upon Trust, that they, or the survivors
"or survivor of them, or the heirs of such survivor,
"shall sell a competent part thereof, in aid of my per-
"sonal estate, for payment of all my debts, of what
"kind soever, and funeral expences; and out of what
"shall remain unfold to pay a yearly rent charge of
"forty pounds to my dearly beloved wife, for her life,
"in addition to her jointure; and a yearly rent charge
"of one hundred pounds to my younger son Hugh
"M'Auley,

those dates, cast a vivid light on the conduct of M'Auley, after he was informed of the contingencies, which gave him, as a remainder-man, an estate; and show distinctly, that he set out from London, immediately, *after* the 24th of April, and returned from Ireland, immediately, *before* the 30th of May 1769. His letter to the Duke of Grafton, of this date, appears, from its whole context, as if the author of it had *resumed a subject*, which he had *for some time forgotten*. Upon the whole, I submit this long note to the reader, as a strong link of the extended chain of circumstantial evidence, which has been accurately arranged, for proving, that M'Auley-Boyd was the writer of Junius's Letters.

" M'Auley, for his life; the said several rent charges
 " to be paid by equal half-yearly payments, upon
 " every first day of May and first day of November,
 " the first payment to be made on such of the said
 " days as shall happen next after my death, and to be
 " recovered by distress; the said yearly rent charge of
 " one hundred pounds to be unto my said son Hugh,
 " in lieu and full satisfaction of and for all claims and
 " demands whatsoever, which he can or may have upon
 " my assets or effects: The said Trustees to stand seised
 " of what shall remain unsold of my real estate (sub-
 " ject to the said several rent charges), In Trust, for
 " my said eldest son Alexander, his heirs and assigns.
 " In Witness whereof I have hereunto, and to a du-
 " plicate hereof, subscribed my name, and affixed my
 " seal, this 23d day of December 1763.


 Seal.

" ALEXANDER M'AULEY."

Administration of the goods, &c. of Alexander
 M'Auley, with the above will annexed, was granted
 to Alexander M'Auley, his natural, and lawful, son,
 on the 23d of May 1767.

It is a fact, which I will mention, on the authority
 of a very intelligent friend of Boyd, in addition to all
 experience, as to the kindly affections of the female
 sex, that when the inattention, and imprudence, of
 Boyd had involved him in the most complicated em-
 barrassments, his mother came from Dublin to Lon-
 don, in order to see how she could relieve him from
 his inextricable difficulties.*

* This excellent woman died in 1782, or 1783.

In p. 60: "Hugh M'Auley-Boyd was now to "maintain a wife and family, as well as he could, by "whatever means." His means may be thus estimated:

	£.	s.	d.
From the will of his father, half-yearly, on the 1st of May, and the 1st of November - - - }	100	0	0
From the estate of Redbay, after his succession, as the remainder-man, in April 1769 - - - }	260	0	0
From his wife's income - - - - -	300	0	0
The total of his yearly income, } which was probably ill paid }	£. 660	0	0

But, in the course of his extreme embarrassments, before he went to India, he had settled on the Redbay estates so many annuities, as to exhaust the whole annual income; and he had prevailed on his wife to dispose of one hundred pounds of her annuity.

Instead of making a fortune in India, M'Auley Boyd was supposed, by intelligent men at Madras, to have died in debt sixty-two thousand star pagodas, or £. 24,800 sterling.

In p. 63: "M'Auley Boyd returned, with his family, to London, probably, in 1775." I have since been informed that, about the year 1776, he rented that commodious house, on the East side of Norfolk-street, in the Strand, next the river; that Mr. Cobb, who was then an eminent upholsterer, in St. Martin's lane, furnished the house for him; that as the value of the furniture was not paid, at the appointed time, Mr. Cobb obtained of Mr. Boyd a bond and judgement, for the debt; amounting to £. 370; that for this sum Mr. Cobb, being still unsatisfied, entered up the judgement, and in autumn 1778 laid his execution on the goods, in the house of Mr. Boyd; that, owing

to the misconduct of the attorney, the sheriff's officer remained in the house for several months, during which time, Mr. Cobb was obliged to pay the rent of the house; that, in the end, Mr. Boyd's man-servant purchased the furniture, which was still in the possession of the sheriff's officer; when Mr. Cobb, after much delay, trouble, and charge, obtained his debt. All the beforementioned facts, I was told by the very person, who was employed by Mr. Cobb to put the furniture into Mr. Boyd's house; and who added, that, after seeing Mr. Boyd frequently, he appeared to him to be a very intelligent, civil, fair-speaking man; but, that he never could find out, who he was, or by what means he lived, only that he had married a West-India lady, with a fortune. Thus much from this intelligent and communicative person, who is now himself an eminent upholsterer.

The fact is, that this transaction was afterwards brought into Westminster-hall, where it is remembered, as *Boyd's Case*, though the lawyers themselves, as they do not clearly recollect the facts, do not distinctly understand the case; for, it was first mentioned to me, as the case of a *distress for rent*, which it could not well be. From one of *the briefs*, in the cause, which brief accident has brought into my hands, I will state *the facts*, for the information of the lawyers. In 1778, and for some years before, there lived with Mr. Boyd a man servant, named John Percy, and a woman servant, his wife, who from many savings, in a course of years, had accumulated money enough to buy £.400, East-India 3 per cent. annuities; and who, seeing an execution so long in the house, were persuaded by Mr. Boyd to sell out their India annuities, to pay off

the debt, and to take the goods, at their appraised value, in the hands of the sheriff's officer. In this manner, was the execution of Mr. Cobb satisfied; and, thereupon, Percy rented the goods to his master, at an yearly sum of £.30. In the subsequent year, 1779, another execution was laid upon the same goods, in the same place, at the suit of one Mr. Workman, who had obtained a bill for £.50 of a third person, which bill Mr. Boyd had indorsed, *to accommodate a friend*. Percy, with the assistance of those, who saw and pitied his situation, satisfied this second execution; and he was thereupon advised to bring an action against the sheriffs Pugh and Wright, in the court of Exchequer, for the recovering back of what he had thus been obliged to pay wrongfully. This action of Percy *v.* Pugh and Wright was tried, on Monday, the 12th of June 1780, at Westminster-hall, before the Lord Chief Baron Skinner, who, in summing up the evidence to the jury, informed them, that there did not arise in the cause any other question of law, but whether the transaction were *bonâ fide*, or *colourable*; which, it was for them to determine, from the evidence. The facts, which have been stated, were so clearly made out in proof, that the jury did not hesitate to find for the plaintiff. The records of Westminster-hall furnish the most indubitable proofs, year after year, of the incorrigible inattention, and endless embarrassments, of M^cAuley Boyd.

I will only add to this singular case, which shows at once the distress, and the imprudence, of Mr. Boyd, that when he departed, in the subsequent year, for Madras, Percy sold his books to John Townson, the late India Director, for about £.70; an inconsiderable sum,
which

which proves what has been already intimated, that Mr. Boyd did not enjoy the benefit of a library.

In p. 70: "How he was particularly employed in 1777, and 1778, I am unable to tell." How he was busily employed, in that period of his various occupations, I have since learned from subsequent inquiries. "When Lauchlan M'Leane, says VERAX(h), came over from the Nabob of Arcot, to serve his interest in the India-house, Mr. Stewart introduced him to Boyd. They dined together at the Shakspeare tavern; and I was of the party till one in the morning, when they went upon business; and I departed. They sat together the whole night; and Mr. Boyd was retained to write in favour of the Nabob's case, and published a pamphlet; and wrote in support of it in the Gazetteer." The fact, however, is, that Boyd became early acquainted with his countryman M'Leane; and, it is in evidence, that Boyd wrote in support of the Nabob's pretensions, in the *Public Advertiser*. He did much more for the Nabob. Every one must remember what debates ensued, at the India-house, when news arrived of the revolution at Madras, which was occasioned by the arrest of Lord Pigot, in pursuance of orders from the majority of the Council. At a Court of Proprietors, on the 7th of May 1777, a motion was made by Sir Herbert Mackworth to recal Lord Pigot, together with the whole council; "in order to have their respective conduct more effectually inquired into." Whereupon, "Mr. BOYD, Mr. Redhead, and Mr. MAC LEANE, alleged, that Mr. Rous had, with-

(b) *True Briton*, 19th Dec. 1799.

"out any foundation, made the Nabob a party in the "question(i)." But, was this our Hugh-Boyd? Yes: The fact may be proved by record-evidence, that, on the 22d of April 1777, £.500 India stock were transferred to Hugh Boyd, Esq. of Norfolk-street, in the Strand, by John Dawes; and was re-transferred, in May, and July, of the same year, after M'Leane had sailed for India.

Boyd not only spoke, but wrote, for the Nabob, in the newspapers, and in pamphlets. During March 1777, the Directors of the India Company appear to have been greatly affected by these publications: And, they published, in the London Gazette of the 29th of March, an advertisement against two pamphlets; because "they conceived the abuse therein to be un-paralleled, the design to be extremely dangerous, "and the object of the author to be the depreciation "of the Company." This notice was immediately encountered by an advertisement from Lauchlan M'Leane, the Nabob's agent, who avowed the two reprobated pamphlets; "having furnished all the materials of which they are composed:" And, he undertook to defend them, at the hazard of his fame(k).

From

(i) Scots Mag. 1777, p. 267.

(k) See the whole proceedings, in the Scots Magazine, 1777, p. 219-20. The two pamphlets, which were thus complained of as *abusive, insidious, and dangerous*, were entitled; 1. "Letter from Mahomed Ali Chan, Nabob of Arcot, to the Court of Directors:" 2. "Original Papers relative to Tanjore." After a careful examination of these two Tracts, I think, that they were both written by M'Auley Boyd, from the documents, which had been furnished by M'Leane. The *state of facts*, which was annexed to this Letter, was plainly drawn by the vigorous, but inaccurate, hand of

Boyd.

From the difficult task of defending the pretensions of the Nabob, it required little of the dexterity of Boyd to engage in the still harder task of vindicating the conduct of the four counsellors, Stratton, Brooke, Floyer, and Mackay, who had overturned the administration of Lord Pigot. He scribbled for them, chiefly, in the news-papers; and, they in return gave, and lent, him money. In pursuance of an address

Boyd. The *Introduction to the Tanjore papers* is still more obviously the elegant, and energetic, work of Boyd. The following passage is copied almost verbatim from his *Antrim Letters*: "Tyranny, cruelty, oppression, laid waste the country without; riot, debauchery, and every species of vice, reigned within the palace." [p. xiii.] This tract, consisting of 134 pages, was sold, on the 12th of December 1796, by Leigh and Sotheby, at the sale of W. Gerard Hamilton's books, for *two-pence*. The Letter from the Nabob was sold, at the same time, for the same price. Neither of these pamphlets seem to have been read by W. G. Hamilton; as the sheets, whereof they consisted, had not been cut open, when they came to my hands. There was another pamphlet, which appeared, at the same time, from the same source, entitled, "Original Papers, transmitted by the Nabob of Arcot to Great Britain;" and which was obviously the compilation of *Boyd*, from the instructions of *M'Leane*.

The *authenticity* of those pamphlets, *M'Leane*, the well-known agent of the Nabob, undertook by public advertisement to assert, under the penalty "of having his *name* *consigned* to *disgrace* and *infamy*." *M'Leane* did not live to pay the forfeiture of *his name*: For, he sailed for India, in 1777, and was heard of never more.

The task of confuting the conjoint pamphlets of *M'Leane*, and *Boyd*, was assigned by the India Directors to Mr. George Rous, under the superintendence of a Committee. After a while, he produced three huge, quarto, volumes of such curious, and authentic, documents, as to reduce the value of the said pamphlets to *two-pence*, a-piece: He entered, indeed, into no reciprocation of smartness: But, such is the difference between *truth*, however simple, and *declamation*, however splendid!

from

from the House of Commons, the four Counsellors were tried, for the before-mentioned misdemeanour, in the court of King's Bench, on the 20th of December 1779: And, being found guilty, though the evidence did not support the inference, which was drawn by the information, they were each of them sentenced to pay a thousand pounds (1). Poor Boyd being in the end hunted, by the terriers of the law, from his house in Norfolk-street, found a covert in the obscurity of Chedley-court, Pall-mall; whence he escaped, on a Sunday morning, to Ireland, on his course to India, in January 1781 (m). It thus appears, notwithstanding what has been already intimated [before, p. 72], that M^r Auley-Boyd, whom we have seen speaking, and writing, as an instrument in M^r Leane's hands, for the Nabob, and scribbling, as an apologist, for his friends, the counsellors, had not to begin *the study of Oriental politicks*, when he arrived, after all his dangers, at Madras.

In

(1) An. Reg. 1779, p. 316: Scots Mag. 1780, p. 102-3.

(m) From some documents, which have fallen into my hands, I observe, that one of the counsellors before mentioned, shabbily reclaimed, of the unhappy Boyd, a debt of an hundred pounds, which had been originally secured on a note of hand, whereon process issued in May 1780; and which debt was finally settled by a bond, dated the 2d of January 1781. He set off for India, immediately after this date; being kindly accommodated by an unalterable friend with £.700, which Boyd never repaid. Boyd arrived at Madras rather *late*, than *early*, in 1781. But, he never acted as secretary, or assistant secretary, to Lord Macartney, who merely gave him his protection. One of his first mortifications, and hindrances, arose from the disadvantageous circumstance, that he was not a servant of the Company: When he was appointed joint harbour-master of Madras with Mr. Corbit, and was named first in

In p. 55: "He certainly acquitted himself with credit at Trinity college; and had a memory of singular strength."—While he still remained at the university, he discovered a very uncommon faculty of carrying on multiplication to a great extent, at least, to the length of multiplying nine figures by nine, with the help of his memory, alone. An intelligent friend, who was intimately acquainted with M^rAuley Boyd,

the commission, his co-partner insisted so strenuously on his right, as a servant of the Company, that the writings were transcribed, and the name of Corbit was inserted before the name of Boyd.

This imprudent man was not in the least changed either in his habits, or his practices, by his change of situation: He learned nothing in the school of adversity: The mind of Boyd scorned the lessons of experience. He became sensible, however, at the sad moment, "when round his death-bed every friend should run," that *some friends had abandoned him*. [Life of Boyd, prefixed to the Ind. Observer, p. 22.] No wonder! A thousand weaknesses, and peccadilloes, are forgiven in young men, which cannot be endured in a man of forty. A transaction happened about that time, which probably brought poor Boyd, with sorrow, to an untimely grave: Capt. Lloyd, of the Manship Indiaman, sold to Boyd a small cargo of printing types, paper, and other articles of stationery; and finding it almost impossible to obtain payment, he discovered with his usual activity, and acuteness, that Boyd had sold the same paper to a third person, for a less value than he had bought it: Upon this discovery, Lloyd told Boyd, that if he did not immediately pay him the price of his goods, he would cause him to be carried into the *criminal* court of Madras: The debt was thereupon paid. Within the ample extent of our biography, there is not a character, which so completely resembles that of Boyd, as the accurate delineation of Savage's life, which Johnson finished, with these apposite reflections: "Let those who, in confidence of superior capacities, or attainments, disregard the common maxims of life, be reminded, that nothing will supply the want of prudence; and that negligence and irregularity, long continued, will make knowledge useless, wit ridiculous, and genius contemptible."

from

from 1766 to 1781, has assured me that, as he knew this remarkable anecdote of him, he laid a wager of a rump and dozen, that he would procure a person, who would multiply nine digits by nine, from the efforts of his memory, alone; that he thereupon spoke to Boyd, who readily undertook to perform this singular operation, in arithmetic, which he knew he could do with ease; that the parties met, for this purpose, at seven o'clock in the morning, in the house of the gentleman, who laid the wager; and that Boyd having performed the task by memory, while the same gentleman made the same calculation with his pen, won the wager. My intelligent friend also informed me, that Boyd appeared to him to derive some help from his fingers (*n*).

In p. 58: "M'Auley Boyd became acquainted with "many members of the *Literary Club*." It is moreover true, as VERAX has indeed intimated, that M'Auley Boyd was a member of the *Anonymous Club*, at the Globe tavern, in Fleet-street, wherein he often spoke: But, his style of oratory was not brilliant: As a speaker, he was, like his father, flow, and sometimes tedious; yet, was he always intelligent, and *figurative*.

As a writer, he had more *facility*: But, as I was told by the same intelligent friend, who knew M'Auley Boyd most thoroughly, he seldom, or never wrote,

(*n*) VERAX, I observe, has remarked, "that Boyd could multiply *five* figures by *five*, and give the sum total, in the dark." [TRUE BRITON.] The fact is, as I have stated, that M'Auley first showed, at Trinity college, this uncommon faculty, which enabled him to carry on the multiplication to *nine figures*. This performance evinced a great strength of memory and steadiness of head.

in the day-time, such were his habits of dissipation; he chose the night, for his lucubrations, after every body had retired to rest, from one to three o'clock, in the morning. This *trait* accounts sufficiently for the inaccuracies, which abound in all his writings, and in his JUNIUS, particularly.

It is a fact, which all who knew Boyd recollect clearly, that his command of temper was such, he could not be agitated into passion, though he could, and often did, make other persons angry by his own coolness. This is another trait of character, which gave him a manifest superiority over his antagonists, both in his JUNIUS, and in his other controversial writings.

In p. 92: "I have impartial evidence to prove, that M'Auley Boyd was forward to show an interest about "the letters of JUNIUS."—The same intelligent friend has also assured me, that M'Auley Boyd *used to carry JUNIUS, in his pocket*; and would sometimes *spout* the more brilliant passages in his favourite author.

In December 1777, Boyd made another visit to Ireland, and resided with his mother in Mary-street, Dublin.

In 1779, he published "Genuine Abstracts from "Two Speeches of the late Earl of Chatham, with "some Introductory Observations and Notes." In these *Introductory Observations*, may be seen the same sentiments, and language, as an attentive reader would perceive in his *Antrim Letters*, and in his *Junius*. Some of the *same sentiments*, I have seen in his *private letters*.

A RECAPITULATION of the ARGUMENT,

IN all cases, wherein the proof is to arise from a variety of circumstances, a *recapitulation* is often necessary, and always useful, for bringing together the distant circumstances, and for drawing the fair inferences from the previous premises.

1. The artifices of *the writer* of JUNIUS, and the interest of his publishers, have, at all times, attributed the writing of these letters to a variety of men, as it suited their several designs, on successive occasions: it, therefore became necessary to shew, by a particular examination, that none of the persons, who had thus been mentioned by artifice, and maligned by interest, as the authors of Junius's letters, were the writers of epistles, which are oftener mentioned, than perfectly understood. It is apparent, that the allegations on these several heads of imputation must necessarily destroy each other, as the *antidote* counteracts *poison*. There are intelligent persons, who even now persuade themselves, that either Edmund Burke, or W. Gerard Hamilton, wrote those letters: Yet both those persons rejected the imputation, at times, when they could not be suspected of fallacy (*a*). What inference can be drawn from the comparison of their public writings, or private epistles, when tried by the satisfactory proofs, which arise from the accurate collation of M'Auley

(*a*) See p. 5—44.

Boyd's productions, supported as such collations are by a thousand collateral circumstances!

2. In order to narrow the question, I have shown, that the letters of JUNIUS were written neither by an English, nor by a Scottish, author; but by a native of Ireland (*b*). I have proved, that Hugh M'Auley was born and educated at Dublin.

3. That the letters of Junius were written by an inexperienced, or a juvenile pen, I have proved beyond contradiction (*c*). As Hugh Boyd was born in April

1746,

(*b*) See the proofs of this position in the note (m) p. 84: Add to these, that the father of Hugh M'Auley uses, in *his will* [p. 130.] the word *Younger*, in the same anomalous sense, as his son used *Elder* for *Eldest*.

(*c*) See p. 85—8: Let me add, that uncommon genius, and premature talents, were not produced, only, at Dublin, and Bristol, during that period: Edinburgh gave to Dr. M'Kenzie a son of considerable genius and forward talents, who died under age in 1780. See the eulogium by Mr. Professor Dalzel, on James M'Kenzie: "At the age of *twelve* his conversation was such as to afford very high pleasure, and even instruction to persons advanced in life." [Scots Mag. 1780, p. 180.] And see specimens of his poetry, at the age of *twelve*, and of *sixteen*. [Ib. 209—10.] Dr. Beattie, of Aberdeen, had once a son, alas! who was, by the recommendation of the Mareschal College, appointed a Professor at the age of *nineteen*, and died in 1790, when he had passed twenty-two. Both M'Kenzie, and Beattie, were not more remarkable for genius, than for their moral qualities: In this last respect, they were far superior to Chatterton, and M'Auley Boyd. Beattie was equal to Chatterton for his intuitive knowledge of life: and he was superior to Boyd, in erudition, and in the qualities of a poet; yet, whether he could have produced such political papers as Boyd's, I am unable to decide: Had Beattie been turned out on the wilds of the world, to seek for subsistence, amidst the competitions of life, he certainly could have written political lucubrations, both in prose and verse, with great acumen, and asperity. [See the instructive life of James Hay Beattie A. M. by Dr. Beattie.] His Majesty's,

1746, and began to write *Junius's* epistles in January 1769, these epistles were written by him in the twenty-third, the twenty-fourth, and the twenty-fifth years of his age: He wrote them, in the midst of *dissipation*, "While nature and nature's works lay hid in night."

4. The letters of *Junius* were published by a person, who delighted *to fish in troubled waters*. So M'Auley Boyd,

"A soldier now, he with his coat appears,

"A *fisher* now, his trembling angle bears (*d*)."

5. The writer of *Junius* was a frequent attendant in both houses of Parliament, who often quotes scraps of parliamentary speeches, as taken by himself (*e*). This trait distinguished M'Auley Boyd above all others.

6. By comparing *JUNIUS* with the other writings of M'Auley Boyd, we see the same characteristics in all: the same elegance and energy; the same inaccuracy and inexperience; the same topics, and imagery, and expressions; the same turbulence; and, even *in his Observer*, may be traced

"The cockle of rebellion, insolence, sedition (*f*)."

7. It

Majesty's reign has been, indeed, very fruitful in premature talents: the King's Minister displayed all the resplendent powers of a great Orator, and profound Statesman, at the early age of twenty-two.

(*a*) See p. 88, and the Gen. Edit. of *Junius*, Pref. xviii.

(*e*) See p. 83—4.

(*f*) See p. 88—9—90; and see particularly the note (*s*) in p. 66: Unless this note can be either answered, or explained away, my position must be admitted, as incontrovertible: For, 1st, it is an undoubted fact, that M'Auley Boyd wrote *the letters* to the Antrim Freeholders, with peculiar references to *JUNIUS*; 2dly, we see transplanted from the one to the other, the same *expressions*, the same *artifices*, the same topics, the same *flowers*, and the same policy; 3dly,

7. It is also a peculiar characteristic of M'Auley-Boyd, that he took a *particular interest* in Junius; he carried Junius in his pocket; he spouted passages from Junius; and, as if he knew the writer, he talked with confidence, that the author never would be discovered (g).

8. The wife of M'Auley-Boyd *often suspected* him of being the author of JUNIUS, and the family of M'Auley-Boyd, in Ireland, have *long had an habitual notion among them, that he was the writer of that famous paper* (h).

9. M'Auley-Boyd never disclaimed the imputation of being the author, like Edmund Burke, W. G. Hamilton, Lord Sackville, and others. He never claimed the honour of writing Junius's letters: If he had, it would now be said, that his vanity claimed what his talents could not execute: But as *deeds* speak more persuasively than *words*, he did that, on several occasions, which is more satisfactory in its inferences: He virtually acknowledged, by his actions, which he did not voluntarily perform, that he was the author of writings, which he had early determined never to avow: "The *deeds* themselves, though *mute*, spoke loud the *doer*" (i).

3dly, as it is a known fact, that he was present at Belfast, while the Antrim Letters were written, he must be acknowledged to be the thief, who stole, with a dexterous hand, the glittering counters of Junius, to bribe his fellow freeholders.

(g) See p. 92—93.

(h) Id.

(i) See page 50-1: He had private, as well as public, motives for not acknowledging himself to be the author of Junius's Epistles: He knew, that his private character could not bear inspection: Add to these intimations, that the morality of Junius and of M'Auley-Boyd are exactly the same.

10. Such are the *affirmative proofs*: We are thus brought to the objections, which are opposed to my inferences, and which consist, chiefly, of the assumptions of sophistry. It is an assumption to suppose, that the writer of Junius was some great personage, some great politician, some great lawyer, some great scholar. (*k*). It is an assumption to argue, that there is in Junius either superior information, or superior knowledge, or any thing either in the matter, or manner, beyond the powers of M'Auley-Boyd to produce (*l*).

11. In order to meet such assumptions; I have shown where, and how, M'Auley-Boyd was educated: In order to account for his *imagery*, I have proved, that while he was a boy, at school, his *prose* exercises were too *poetical* to please his father (*m*).

12. With the design to shew what he could write, I have produced what he did write; consisting of various specimens of M'Auley-Boyd's writings, in prose, and verse; and I have contrasted his political papers,

(*k*). See p. 3—5—44—46.

(*l*). See p. 45—8: Add to the proofs therein given, the writer's notes to his *Genuine Edition* of Junius, in which the inquisitive reader will see the sort of books, which he quotes, and quotes like a lawyer:—The *History of the Minority*. [Gen. Ed. vol. 1. p. 78.] De Lolme on the Constitution. [Pref.] Montesquieu [Ib. 52.] The *Case of the Middlesex Election*. [Ib. 45.] Blackstone's Commentaries. [Ib. 161.] Pope's Letters. [Ib. 185.] Torcy's Memoirs. [Ib. 197.] Ben Johnson. [Vol. II. p. 96.] Doctor Musgrave's *Examination*. [Ib. 99.] Letter on Libels. [Ib. 20.] Coke, 2 Inst. [Ib. 123.] Hawkins. [Ib. 165.] Congreve's *Double Dealer*. [Ib. 210.] 4 Inst. 2 Hale, P. C. The Statutes. [Ib. 320—1.] State Tr. [Ib. 323.] Selden by N. Bacon 182. [Ib. 327.] Parliamentary History. [Id.] Such was the library of JUNIUS!!!

(*m*.) See before p. 53—4.

§

which

which were successively published, under different signatures, on the same anarchical principle; having the same topicks and energies, the same faults and beauties: On this head, I have shown, by contrast, that the defects and excellencies, the affectations of imagery, and the peculiarities of spirit, in his *Junius* and in his *Observer*, are the same (*n*), though they were certainly written with dissimilar aims.

13. For the purpose of letting in the evidence of the writer's widow, I have exhibited the record of their marriage; which record, when coupled with other proofs, precludes the fatal objection of an *alibi*, and prevents the less formidable remark of the improbability that, in his circumstances, he would marry at so early an age.

14. Lastly: I have not either seen in the public controversy, or heard in private conversation, any other objections, than doubts and hesitations, sophisms and fictions, which, when opposed to affirmative proofs, must appear to be of so airy and light a quality, that they are but the shadows of a shadow: Considering, then, that there are satisfactory evidence for the affirmative position, and no evidence for the negative, I must be allowed to conclude, with TILLOTSON, that "those things are *certain* among men, which cannot be denied without obstinacy and folly."

(*n*.) See before p. 66—96—99—109—111—112—116—119.

F I N I S.

My dear Mr. [illegible]

I have just [illegible]

been [illegible]

to [illegible]

and [illegible]

of [illegible]

the [illegible]

of [illegible]

the [illegible]

of [illegible]

the [illegible]

of [illegible]

the [illegible]

of [illegible]

the [illegible]

J. H.

Holyhead.

Here I am; —
to be for a day or two longer. — I
ill-naturedly in the teeth of the
Lopes, it will not be measurable;
veer about for us: — I wish
if there might be these speedy Lopes
know I mean only the Carb & the
Ornaments of the Treasury Bench
of the House where P. G. P. sits

Lead, Saturday Dec. 6th 1777

— & I much fear, likely
— For the Wind is most
Harbour. But it is to be
— & that it will soon
Aiolus were a Patriot;
dopes of his turning:— you
Patriots;— the eye-balls
ch &c — :— & now on the side
its.

Yrs. very use &
Hugh Boyd